



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 2014

No. 24

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MESSER).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 10, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable LUKE MESSER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2014, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m.

IRAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, over the last several weeks, I have come to the House floor on numerous occasions to talk about the interim nuclear agreement that this administration is negotiating with Iran. I have come here to discuss exactly what that administration is—or, more importantly, isn't—negotiating and what that means for our national security and the stability of the region as a whole.

While there can be no question that we need to continue having that discussion about whatever else the regime in Tehran decides to do, like send warships off of our eastern coast, we also need to take some time to discuss what exactly the real power brokers in Iran are doing when they aren't talking about destroying Israel or attacking America.

Many of my colleagues have been down on this very floor before to discuss the oppressive nature of the Iranian regime. It is important that we remind folks just how tyrannical those who are in power there really are.

So, just what exactly have we seen since the election of the self-described moderate President in Iran? We have largely seen the continuation of the same human rights abuses that we have seen for years in Iran. We have seen the grip of Tehran's media and Internet sensors tighten since Mr. Rouhani came to power. Web sites have been restricted and mobile phone applications have also been blocked. There have also been reports of numerous newspapers and blogs being shut down altogether and their reporters and editors being arrested.

Now, what do they all have in common, Mr. Speaker? What they have in common is these people advocate for reform and are critical of the regime in Iran. We have seen a number of Iran's executions occur at an alarming rate since Mr. Rouhani took office. There are many theories as to why this is happening, but the fact remains, somewhere upwards of 60 people are being executed each month in Iran. Some of these executions are being carried out in public with those in charge intentionally leaving the bodies to hang from construction cranes in public areas.

We have seen the persecution of religious minorities. We should all support freedom of religion, and the regime's persistent crackdowns and arrests of

Christians, the Baha'is, and other religious minorities should trouble everyone.

Mr. Speaker, as I have talked about before, Iran continues to prop up Hezbollah across the Middle East. Their involvement across the region is widely noted. Of particular concern should be their connection to Syria. Iran sends trained murderers and weapons to prolong the brutal civil war that continues to destroy Syria, separate families, and cause millions to flee their country.

Sadly, this is not even a comprehensive list of what goes on inside of Iran. We could discuss their appalling human rights trafficking record or their full record of sponsoring terrorism, in addition to what we have already discussed.

Why is all of this important when we are talking about the administration's pursuit of a nuclear deal with Iran? Two reasons: first, it should serve as a stark reminder of just whom exactly the Obama administration is really negotiating with; second, it shows the true intentions and belief of those that are really in power in Iran. It shows the disconnect between the rhetoric of the self-described moderate President and what is really going on within Iran's borders. Above all, it shows where the real power lies, which is in the hands of the Supreme Leader of Iran.

To forget about the plight of the Iranian people and not address what happens domestically in Iran would be a failure, plain and simple, and one which will continue to cost innocent lives.

BREAD FOR THE WORLD'S ANNUAL HUNGER REPORT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for 5 minutes.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H1689

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to and highlight Bread for the World's annual hunger report. This year's report is entitled, "Ending Hunger in America." Frankly, it couldn't be more appropriate or timely.

Mr. Speaker, over 49 million Americans go hungry every year, and we in the Federal Government—we in this Congress—are not doing nearly enough to fight to end hunger in this country. In fact, over the past 6 months, Congress stood by and let an \$11 billion cut to the premier antihunger safety net program, SNAP, take effect. To make matters worse, Congress followed up by enacting another \$8 billion cut to SNAP as part of the farm bill. We should all be ashamed.

The fact is Congress continues to make it harder and harder for the hungry in America to make ends meet and put food on their table. Although the Obama administration came into the office under the most difficult economic conditions in nearly a century, they also came in with a lot of promise. In fact, President Obama came in with, among other things, a pledge to end childhood hunger in America by 2015. That goal was achievable. Unfortunately, we have gone backwards over the past 5 years.

While I still believe there is time for the Obama administration to turn this around and make some real headway in the fight to end hunger, the sad reality is we are not going to end child hunger in America by 2015, and may not even make a significant dent in hunger by the end of this administration.

Just because President Obama will not meet his stated goal doesn't mean we should give up. That is why I am encouraged by this report from Bread for the World. First and foremost, it is refreshing that this report is honest and blunt. It rightfully states that hunger is a subset of poverty and that we can't truly end hunger without addressing poverty.

Just look at a few of the statistics listed in the report:

The average incomes of the top 1 percent of households rose by 19.6 percent in 2012, while the incomes of the other 99 percent grew just by 1 percent.

Nearly two-thirds of SNAP recipients are children, elderly, or disabled. Among SNAP households with children and at least one working-age, non-disabled adult, 62 percent work while receiving SNAP and 87 percent work in the prior or subsequent year, which hopefully should put to rest this distortion that somehow people on SNAP don't want to work.

Another statistic here is that while children make up roughly 24 percent of our total population, they comprise one-third of the Nation's poor.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that poverty must be addressed because that is the root cause of hunger. But Bread for the World lays out achievable and timely goals, goals that are not pie in the sky but actually doable. They call an end

for hunger in America by 2030, and they do so in a four-point plan: one, a jobs agenda; two, a stronger safety net; three, human capital development; and four, public-private partnerships to support community-led initiatives against hunger.

They call for achievable goals of a 25 percent reduction in hunger by 2017, a 50 percent reduction by 2023, and completely ending hunger by 2030. We can do this if we make the political decision to focus on and commit to ending hunger.

I fully support this plan. I only want to move quicker to achieve the goal of ending hunger. This report rightly states:

Ending hunger in the United States will require leadership not only at the Federal level, but also the State and local levels.

We already have Governors and mayors who are working to combat hunger. Governors Deval Patrick of Massachusetts and Don Beebe of Arkansas are committed to this effort. Former Boston Mayor Tom Menino was a leader; and I know the new mayors of New York and Boston, Bill de Blasio and Marty Walsh, are just as committed. And they aren't the only ones, but we need more help and commitment. The White House should convene a conference on food and nutrition to build on the recommendations in the Bread for the World report and come up with a comprehensive, holistic plan to end hunger in America.

Hunger at its core is a political condition. We know how to end it. We have the food and the resources to end hunger once and for all; we just don't have the political will to do so. Bread for the World, through this annual report and through their everyday actions, is trying to build the political will to end hunger in America. I know we can do it.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PETRI) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Dear God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We ask Your special blessing upon the Members of this people's House. They face difficult decisions in difficult times, with many forces and interests demanding their attention.

In these days give wisdom to all the Members, that they might execute their responsibilities to the benefit of all Americans. And may their constituents understand, as well, that many in this country have interests at odds with their own, and that the task entrusted to their representatives is extremely complex.

Bless us, O God, and be with us all this day and every day to come. May all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

THE STATUS QUO DESTROYS JOBS

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, a weekend editorial by The Washington Times stated:

The unemployment rate fell in January, which ought to be good news. But it isn't. Over the past decade, we have fallen into a strange and puzzling wonderland of opposites, where "economic recovery" comes with no growth, and unemployment rates drop when people aren't working.

The President's misleading message conveys that fewer jobs and government dependency is the new status quo, which destroys fulfilling lives.

Last week, a Congressional Budget Office report confirmed what the NFIB

and House Republicans have been saying for years: ObamaCare is destroying and will destroy 2.5 million jobs. 2.5 million fewer Americans will be out of work due to the President's health care takeover.

Our economy cannot truly recover unless ObamaCare is repealed. The President's Big Government policies are destroying jobs. House Republicans have solutions that will put Americans back to work. We understand the status quo should be job growth to help our middle class families achieve opportunity.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

THIRD YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF BAHRAIN PROTESTS

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the third anniversary of the peaceful uprising in Bahrain. Three years after mass protests filled the streets, the Bahraini Government's promises of reform remain unfulfilled. Systematic human rights abuses, restrictions on freedom of expression, and arbitrary detention continue unabated.

Nabeel Rajab, a prisoner of conscience whom I have adopted as part of the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission's Defending Freedoms project, is one of thousands who have been detained or tortured for peacefully calling for reforms. Prisoners like Nabeel are denied access to medical treatment, and many are prevented from speaking about their abuse, even to their families and lawyers.

Because Bahrain is our ally and home to the 5th Fleet, the U.S. has the responsibility to ensure that the Bahraini Government adheres to its human rights commitments and enacts meaningful reforms. These should include releasing political prisoners and ensuring accountability for torture. Absent such steps, the U.S. must consider contingency planning for the relocation of the fleet.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 5:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1730

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BLACK) at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

NATIONAL INTEGRATED DROUGHT INFORMATION SYSTEM REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2013

Mr. HALL. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2431) to reauthorize the National Integrated Drought Information System as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2431

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "National Integrated Drought Information System Reauthorization Act of 2013".

SEC. 2. NIDIS PROGRAM AMENDMENTS.

Section 3 of the National Integrated Drought Information System Act of 2006 (15 U.S.C. 313d) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting before the period at the end the following: "to better inform and provide for more timely decision-making to reduce drought related impacts and costs";

(2) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

"(b) SYSTEM FUNCTIONS.—The National Integrated Drought Information System shall—

"(1) provide an effective drought early warning system that—

"(A) collects and integrates information on the key indicators of drought and drought impacts in order to make usable, reliable, and timely forecasts of drought, including assessments of the severity of drought conditions and impacts; and

"(B) provides such information, forecasts, and assessments on both national and regional levels;

"(2) communicate drought forecasts, drought conditions, and drought impacts on an ongoing basis to public and private entities engaged in drought planning and preparedness, including—

"(A) decisionmakers at the Federal, regional, State, tribal, and local levels of government;

"(B) the private sector; and

"(C) the public;

"(3) provide timely data, information, and products that reflect local, regional, and State differences in drought conditions;

"(4) coordinate, and integrate as practicable, Federal research and monitoring in support of a drought early warning system;

"(5) build upon existing forecasting and assessment programs and partnerships, including through the designation of one or more cooperative institutes to assist with National Integrated Drought Information System functions; and

"(6) continue ongoing research and monitoring activities related to drought, including research activities relating to length, severity, and impacts of drought and the role of extreme weather events and climate variability in drought."; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(e) REPORT.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of the National Integrated Drought Information System Reauthorization Act of 2013, the Under Secretary shall transmit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report that contains—

"(A) an analysis of the implementation of the National Integrated Drought Information System program, including how the information, forecasts, and assessments are utilized in drought policy planning and response activities;

"(B) specific plans for continued development of such program, including future milestones; and

"(C) an identification of research, monitoring, and forecasting needs to enhance the predictive capability of drought early warnings that include—

"(i) the length and severity of droughts;

"(ii) the contribution of weather events to reducing the severity or ending drought conditions; and

"(iii) regionally specific drought impacts.

"(2) CONSULTATION.—In developing the report under paragraph (1), the Under Secretary shall consult with relevant Federal, regional, State, tribal, and local government agencies, research institutions, and the private sector."

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 4 of such Act (15 U.S.C. 313d note) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

"There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act \$13,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HALL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 2431, the bill now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2431, a bill to reauthorize the National Integrated Drought Information System.

I want to thank Chairman SMITH for his good work in bringing this bill to the House floor and for his bipartisan support. I also want to thank the gentleman and Representative BEN LUJÁN of New Mexico for joining me as an original sponsor. In 1998, Congress passed the National Drought Policy Act, establishing a Commission to provide recommendations on Federal drought policies.

The concept of creating a national drought monitoring and information system was proposed by the Commission in its 2000 report and promoted by various stakeholders, including the Western Governors' Association and in the 2004 report, "Creating a Drought Early Warning System for the 21st Century."

I was pleased to become involved in this effort with former Congressman and now-Senator MARK UDALL and to introduce the NIDIS Act of 2006, which Congress passed and became public law.

NIDIS is administered within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. NIDIS established the U.S. Drought Portal, which has become a very valuable resource for decision-makers at the Federal, State, and local levels, and for farmers, businessmen, and individuals.

This Web site provides current data for weather observations, early warnings about droughts, and support services for managing droughts. The Web site includes the U.S. Drought Monitor map, another valuable feature that is updated weekly. For example, according to the most recent Drought Monitor map, about 21 percent of the U.S. is experiencing severe to exceptional drought conditions. More than 56 percent of the country has abnormally dry to exceptional drought conditions.

Madam Speaker, NIDIS is an example of a program that is working effectively and that has broad support. Rather than creating a new government bureaucracy, NIDIS represents a collaborative framework between Federal, states, and academic partners.

The NIDIS reauthorization will improve interagency coordination, early warnings, critical data sharing, and decision services related to drought. The bill encourages further research, monitoring, and forecasting, along with further development of regional early warning systems.

Madam Speaker, reauthorizing NIDIS will strengthen this important program and will help our State, it will help the local, and it will help the Federal officials, farmers, and water managers better prepare for and respond to drought.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2431, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 2431, the National Integrated Drought Information System Reauthorization Act of 2013. This vital program, known as NIDIS, was originated by my friend and former committee chair, Mr. RALPH HALL, in 2006. The program provides critical drought information to communities all across our Nation.

Over the past three decades, it is estimated that droughts have cost our country hundreds of billions of dollars in economic impacts. Loss estimates from the 2012 drought alone run upwards of \$70 billion. Moreover, the effects of climate change are anticipated to exacerbate this problem in many parts of the country, including my home State of Texas.

Right now, California is experiencing its driest period in recorded history. Sixty-seven percent of the State of California is experiencing extreme or

exceptional drought conditions. We all know that farmers and ranchers bear the brunt of these dry conditions. That hits the pocketbooks of every American as food prices do go up, but the damage is not limited to agriculture.

For instance, in the West, conditions are again ripe for extreme wildfires that scarred more than 9 million acres last year, putting homes and properties in jeopardy.

Tourism is suffering as water levels in lakes and rivers plummet and snow packs languish, leaving boats on dry land and skis in the attic. Communities are imposing water restrictions, and power plants and grid operators are taking a serious look at the emergency plans should water for cooling towers and hydroelectric dams fall short.

If you look at the top five most expensive disasters in the United States since 1980, three of those are due to drought. The NIDIS program is intended to help alleviate some of the economic impacts of drought.

Notably, one of the program's goals is to improve drought early warning. Advanced warning of impending droughts would allow States, localities, and farmers to better plan their activities so that the economic costs associated with droughts could be reduced or mitigated.

In light of the scope of the economic impacts of drought, and the potential of the NIDIS program to lessen these impacts, I remain concerned about the authorization levels in H.R. 2431. My Democratic colleagues and I tried to modestly increase the authorization levels during committee consideration of the bill, but we were not successful.

Every witness who has ever testified or spoken to our committee about this program has highlighted the need to improve the program's early warning capability. This isn't a goal that can be accomplished for free. It will take a sustained investment of additional funds to achieve results we desperately need.

While I wish the authorization numbers in the bill before us today were higher, they are much better than the numbers in the Senate bill, which locks the program into a funding cap that is below current spending for the next 5 years.

When the Federal Government is spending tens of billions of dollars per year to mitigate the effects of drought, I think it makes sense to spend a couple million extra dollars to try to reduce those massive costs to our taxpayers in our communities. It is pretty clear that in this instance an ounce of prevention will get us a pound of cure.

In spite of these concerns, however, I support H.R. 2431 and the reauthorization of NIDIS, a program which provides crucial information to help our farmers and communities prepare for and mitigate the impacts of drought.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1745

Mr. HALL. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the

gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the former chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee for yielding me time.

H.R. 2431, the National Integrated Drought Information System Reauthorization Act of 2013, makes minor improvements to the NIDIS program and helps establish better drought forecasting and coordination.

I am glad that the Science, Space, and Technology Committee's chairman emeritus, Congressman RALPH HALL of Texas, is the lead sponsor of this bill and the original author of the NIDIS authorization in 2006. I thank the gentleman for his persistent leadership over the years on this issue.

Recent droughts in Texas and around the country have been severe. The NIDIS program has helped State and local governments, farmers, ranchers, and others both monitor and predict drought conditions.

More than one-third of the United States is currently experiencing moderate to severe drought conditions. By some estimates, the historic drought in 2012 cost our national economy as much as \$70 billion.

NIDIS is a good program that has a history of bipartisan support. It represents the kind of interagency and intergovernmental cooperation that we need to reauthorize in this difficult fiscal environment.

As a success story, the NIDIS program currently operates the U.S. Drought Portal, a Web site that features a range of services related to drought. This includes historical data on past droughts, current data from climate observations, early warnings about emerging and potential droughts, decision support services for managing droughts, and a forum for stakeholders to discuss drought-related issues.

These services have been vital to our efforts to better forecast as well as understand the conditions that lead to drought. This bill reauthorizes an important program that provides early warnings about potential droughts. It also supports services for local and State decisionmakers to better manage and prepare for drought conditions.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT).

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Texas, though at this moment I feel like I am surrounded by Texans in this particular discussion.

I am from Arizona. I am actually from the desert part of Arizona in the desert Southwest. So why is a bill such as H.R. 2431 so important to us?

The data collection and the management of the data models for those of us

who are in an arid region of the country is really, really important to us. We have come so far in the last couple of decades. The ability for my water management authorities in our reservoirs to know what is happening in the snowpacks all the way up into Colorado and on this side of the Continental Divide and learning whether we are moving into a “La Nina” or “El Nino” year—which actually makes huge differences to the expected rainfall, particularly in the winter months, in the desert Southwest—is important to us because we are getting better and better at forecasting even a year out in our expectations.

And so I have great appreciation for the gentlewoman from Texas, the chairman emeritus, and the other chairman from Texas, one more time—remember, as Texans, you are easterners to those of us in Arizona—because this bill is appreciated.

I know there is always a discussion about funding. But one of my great interests in this is the continued movement of the data-sharing as our universities across the country, particularly in the Southwest, build better and better and healthier and more robust models and the ability for that data to help States like mine manage our water resources into the future.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I would simply urge support for H.R. 2431, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2431, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. HALL. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

SUPPORTING THE DEMOCRATIC AND EUROPEAN ASPIRATIONS OF THE PEOPLE OF UKRAINE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 447) supporting the democratic and European aspirations of the people of Ukraine, and their right to choose their own future free of intimidation and fear, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 447

Whereas a democratic, prosperous, and independent Ukraine is in the national interest of the United States;

Whereas the Government of Ukraine has declared integration with Europe a national

priority and has made significant progress toward meeting the requirements for an Association Agreement;

Whereas on November 21, 2013, following several months of intense outside pressure, Ukrainian President Viktor Yanukovich abruptly suspended negotiations on the Association Agreement one week before it was due to be signed at the European Union's Eastern Partnership Summit in Vilnius, Lithuania;

Whereas this reversal of stated government policy precipitated demonstrations by hundreds of thousands of Ukrainian citizens in Kyiv as well as in cities throughout the country;

Whereas the demonstrators have been overwhelmingly peaceful and have sought to exercise their constitutional rights to freely assemble and express their opposition to President Yanukovich's decision;

Whereas the demonstrators have consistently expressed their support for democracy, human rights, greater government accountability, and the rule of law, as well as for closer relations with Europe;

Whereas on November 30, 2013, police violently dispersed peaceful demonstrators in Kyiv's Independence Square, resulting in many injuries and the arrest of several dozen individuals;

Whereas on December 11, 2013, police raided 3 opposition media outlets and the headquarters of an opposition party;

Whereas on December 11, 2013, despite President Yanukovich's statement the previous day that he would engage in talks with the opposition, police attempted to forcibly evict peaceful protesters from central locations in Kyiv;

Whereas several journalists, including from Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, and civic activists supporting the demonstrators have been brutally attacked;

Whereas on January 16, 2014, the Ukrainian parliament passed, and President Yanukovich signed, legislation which severely limits the right of peaceful protest, constrains freedom of speech and the independent media, and unduly restricts civil society organizations;

Whereas the passage of these undemocratic measures and President Yanukovich's refusal to engage in substantive dialogue with opposition leaders precipitated several days of violence and resulted in several deaths and hundreds of injuries, as well as numerous allegations of police brutality; and

Whereas in the face of spreading demonstrations, Ukrainian Government representatives and opposition leaders have entered into negotiations which on January 28, 2014, resulted in the resignation of the Prime Minister and his cabinet and the repeal of most of the anti-democratic laws from January 16, 2014: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) greatly values the warm and close relationship the United States has established with Ukraine since that country regained its independence in 1991;

(2) supports the democratic and European aspirations of the people of Ukraine, and their right to choose their own future free of intimidation and fear;

(3) calls on the United States and the European Union to continue to work together to support a peaceful resolution to the crisis, and to continue to support the desire of millions of Ukrainian citizens for democracy, human rights, government accountability, and the rule of law, and closer relations with Europe;

(4) urges the Government of Ukraine, Ukrainian opposition parties, and all protesters to exercise the utmost restraint and avoid confrontation, and calls on the Gov-

ernment of Ukraine to live up to its international obligations and respect and uphold the democratic rights of its citizens, including the freedom of assembly and expression, as well as the freedom of the press;

(5) condemns all acts of violence and calls on the Government of Ukraine to bring to justice those responsible for violence and brutality against peaceful protesters, and to release and drop any criminal charges against those detained for peacefully exercising their democratic rights;

(6) welcomes the repeal by the Ukrainian parliament of most of the anti-democratic measures adopted on January 16, 2014, and urges President Yanukovich to continue to engage in substantive talks with opposition leaders to address the legitimate grievances of the opposition, and to take additional steps to de-escalate tensions;

(7) urges the United States and the European Union to continue to make clear to Ukraine's leaders that those who authorize or engage in violence against peaceful protesters will be held personally accountable;

(8) supports the measures taken by the Department of State to revoke the visas of several Ukrainians linked to the violence, and encourages the Administration to consider additional targeted sanctions against those who authorize or engage in the use of force; and

(9) urges all parties to engage in constructive, sustained dialogue in order to find a peaceful solution to Ukraine's current political and economic crisis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and introduce extraneous materials on this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to thank my good friend and distinguished colleague, the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, ELIOT ENGEL, for introducing this bipartisan resolution supporting the democratic aspirations of the Ukrainian people.

It is a timely appeal to the Government of Ukraine to stand down and to avoid all further violence, to exercise the utmost restraint and avoid confrontation. It calls on the government to bring to justice those responsible for violence against peaceful protesters and to release and drop any criminal charges against those detained for peacefully exercising their democratic rights.

At this point, the government's crackdown has led to the deaths of at least four protesters—perhaps more—and throughout Ukraine to numerous beatings, arrests, detentions, abductions—including some from hospitals—

the harassment of activists, journalists, medics, lawyers, and pro-democracy NGOs.

On the Kyiv Maidan alone, or Independence Square, more than 1,800 individuals, mostly protesters but also some riot police, have been injured. Thirty-six persons are confirmed missing, 49 people remain in detention, and 26 are under house arrest. At least 30 medics working to aid the injured on the Maidan have been attacked.

Also, 136 journalists have been attacked on the Maidan, including investigative journalist Tetyana Chornovol, brutally beaten on Christmas Day, and who investigators, rather incredibly, claimed was a victim of road rage.

One of the most outrageous examples has been the case of activist Dmitry Bulatov, who was abducted for 8 days before being left in a forest outside of Kyiv, during which time he was tortured by his captors who tried to force him to say he was an American spy.

The heroism, Madam Speaker, of the Ukrainian people persistently demonstrating, struggling, and risking themselves for justice and dignity is deeply inspiring. The witness of so many clergy on the Maidan is a powerful reminder of the spiritual values that are at stake.

Just last Thursday, I had the high honor and privilege of meeting in my office with Patriarch Filaret of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church and Patriarch Sviatoslav of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church. These brave and holy religious leaders are deeply concerned for the faithful—and for the whole Ukrainian nation—and alarmed about the potential for even worse violence, perhaps even civil conflict.

Patriarch Filaret said recently:

I appeal to both the power and opposition to stop violence and to come to the negotiating table. All of you are responsible before God for your earthly doings.

At the Vatican, Pope Francis called for an end to the violence, and said:

I am close to Ukraine in prayer and, in particular, to those who have lost their lives in recent days and to their families. I hope that a constructive dialogue between the institutions and civil society can take place, that any resort to violence is avoided, and that the spirit of peace and a search for common ground is in the hearts of all.

Cardinal Timothy Dolan of New York expressed strong support for antigovernment protesters in Ukraine. Writing on his blog, he summarized the conflict as “government thugs relishing the chance to bludgeon and harass the hundreds of thousands of patriotic Ukrainians,” and described the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church as “a church that has been starved, jack-booted, imprisoned, tortured, persecuted, and martyred by Hitler, Stalin, and company.”

That said, Madam Speaker, I do want to note that there is a paradox here. I know there are many outstanding people working in and for the Ukrainian Government who love their country and have its best interest at heart.

Last year, for example, I met many times with Ukrainian ministers, high-level officials, and the ambassador, including meetings in Kyiv. This was because, in 2013, Ukrainian Foreign Minister Kozhara chaired the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe and made the fight against human trafficking a top priority for the organization.

In June, it held a high-level conference in Kyiv to investigate and promulgate best practices and ways that the 57 OSCE countries can better coordinate antitrafficking efforts, including through training transportation and hospitality industry employees in victim identification. The Kyiv call to action was serious and successful. I know because I was there. And what came out of that was a new OSCE plan of action to combat human trafficking.

Madam Speaker, I want to point out that this resolution does not take any position on whether Ukraine should sign an Association Agreement with the European Union. That is a decision for the Ukrainians to make themselves.

At the committee markup, we decided to make that point clear, and the message should be clear. This is not about politics; this is about human rights. Congress is supporting the Ukrainian people in their defense of universal human values and not inserting itself into the question of what Ukraine does vis-a-vis the European Union.

Madam Speaker, the Ukrainian people have endured horrific suffering over the course of the last century, and this is what gives their peaceful resistance on the Maidan such power.

Two world wars were fought on their soil. In the 1930s, as we all know, Stalin inflicted a genocidal famine on them, which resulted in the death of millions of men, women, and children, to say nothing of 70 years as a captive nation in the Soviet Union.

In the 1980s, many of us in this Chamber, and on the Helsinki Commission especially, spoke out on behalf of Ukrainian human rights activists imprisoned in the gulag, called for the legalization of the then-banned and repressed Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church, and held several hearings on the Chernobyl disaster.

With Ukraine's long-awaited independence in 1991, newfound freedoms also became a reality—or, we thought. But since 2010, with the election of Viktor Yanukovich, human rights, rule of law, and democracy have been under relentless attack—symbolized by the continued unjust imprisonment of former Prime Minister and opposition leader Yulia Tymoshenko, whose daughter, Yevhenia, testified at a Helsinki Commission hearing I held in May of 2012 and on whose behalf I, along with my colleagues, introduced a resolution in the previous Congress.

□ 1800

It is the Ukrainian people's dissatisfaction with Yanukovich, his roll-

back of democracy, that drives the protest movement. The long-suffering Ukrainian people deserve a government that treats them with dignity and treats them with respect. I am confident they will prevail in their heroic struggle.

I strongly support this resolution and, again, thank my friend from New York for authoring it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 447, a resolution I authored supporting the democratic and European aspirations of the people of Ukraine.

I would first like to thank my original cosponsors, Chairman ED ROYCE and Representatives WILLIAM KEATING, ranking member of the Europe Subcommittee; and MARCY KAPTUR, SANDY LEVIN, and JIM GERLACH, of the Ukraine Caucus, for their invaluable help in crafting this bipartisan resolution.

I also thank my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), for his remarks and agree with everything he said.

The United States has been a staunch supporter of a democratic, prosperous, and sovereign Ukraine. At this moment we must stand with the people of Ukraine more than ever before.

As the world has watched, over the past several months, hundreds of thousands of ordinary Ukrainian citizens have turned out in Kyiv and cities throughout the country to exercise their democratic rights and express their views.

The initial impetus for the demonstration was the Ukrainian Government's unexpected rejection of an offer from the European Union for closer political and economic ties. This rejection represented a reversal of government policy and, in the view of a great many Ukrainians, a lost opportunity for Ukraine to strengthen democratic institutions and values and increase economic opportunities.

In addition, the demonstrators have turned out not only in support of closer relations with Europe, but also more fundamentally in support of democracy, good governance, human rights, and basic human dignity. The fact that they have done so in an overwhelmingly peaceful manner is very, very impressive. It is also inspiring.

Sadly, there have been exceptions to the peaceful nature of the protests. These include police violence on several occasions late last year, the disturbing pattern of beatings and abductions of journalists and civil society activists, and the most recent and tragic violence in January.

Following this dramatic increase in tensions last month, the most recent developments in Ukraine give some cause for hope. I welcome the fact that meaningful talks appear to have begun between the government and opposition leaders.

I would also like to applaud the admirable efforts of the Obama administration and our European partners to deescalate tensions and support this dialogue.

Nevertheless, the situation in Ukraine remains highly volatile, and it is imperative that we actively support a peaceful, negotiated end to this crisis.

This resolution advances to that goal by strongly condemning all acts of violence, irrespective of their perpetrators. Let me also take this opportunity to condemn all acts of extremism in Ukraine, all acts of hatred, and all acts of anti-Semitism.

Moreover, the resolution calls on all individuals to behave responsibly. In particular, it calls on the Ukrainian authorities to respect and uphold the democratic rights of the citizens of Ukraine.

It also states that those who authorize or engage in violence should be held personally accountable for their actions, including by targeted sanctions, if appropriate. This is why I welcome the recent actions by the Department of State to revoke the visas of several individuals linked to the violence.

The resolution further urges the Ukrainian Government to bring to justice those responsible for violence against peaceful protesters, journalists, and civic activists, and to take additional steps to deescalate tensions.

Finally, the resolution urges all parties to continue the substantive and sustained dialogue to peacefully resolve the crisis and address the legitimate desire of millions of Ukrainian citizens for a democratic, European future looking West, not East.

In sum, the passage of this resolution would send a strong message of support to the people of Ukraine. At this critical moment, they should know that the United States and the United States Congress stand with them as they seek to build a democratic, prosperous, and secure Ukraine, respecting human rights and dignity and anchored firmly in Europe.

I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 447.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GERLACH), the cochair of the Ukrainian Caucus.

Mr. GERLACH. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey.

Madam Speaker, I rise today because, every now and then, we are reminded that there are still people around the world fighting fiercely to secure the same individual liberties and foster the very same democratic traditions that Americans have been blessed with for nearly 238 years.

During the past 3 months, hundreds of thousands of Ukrainian citizens have taken to the streets of Kyiv and other cities in peaceful protest of a government that has ignored the will of the

people and steered the country away from closer ties to democratic allies and supporters.

The initial response from Ukrainian President Viktor Yanukovich was brutal. Government forces attacked protesters, resulting in at least five reported deaths.

Furthermore, President Yanukovich enacted harsh new laws aimed at snuffing out dissent by making it a crime to peacefully protest against the government.

Thanks to the vigilance of my colleagues in the Congressional Ukrainian Caucus and the leadership of Congressman ENGEL, Chairman ROYCE, and Subcommittee Ranking Member KEATING, the actions of President Yanukovich have not gone unnoticed here in the United States Congress.

Many of us have individually condemned the use of violent, repressive tactics against the protesters. Those of us in the Congressional Ukrainian Caucus have tried to convey to those fighting for democracy in Ukraine that their efforts are not in vain, and that totalitarianism must not be allowed to rise again in any fashion.

Today, all of us in the House have a chance to stand united with our friends in Ukraine who desire greater economic opportunity and individual liberty. So I urge my colleagues to pass this resolution to let the world know the United States will not stand by and allow repression, violence, and political intimidation to prevail in Ukraine.

Let's adopt this resolution for all those in Ukraine who wish for a government that is transparent, honors the fundamental human rights of its citizens, and respects the dignity of all Ukrainians, regardless of political affiliation.

I thank the gentleman from California for introducing this resolution. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for recognizing me.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee.

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. Thank you, Mr. ENGEL, for yielding, and to Mr. SMITH also, congratulations on your work.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Resolution 447, supporting the democratic aspirations of the Ukrainian people and their right to choose their country's future and to choose its direction, free from fear or intimidation, whether internal or external.

For 3 months now, countless scores of Ukrainians across the country have braved not only the bitter cold, but also the constant threat of government-authorized violence, to peacefully stand up for the universal principles of democracy and respect for human rights.

With this resolution, we, in the U.S. House, stand with them now.

A few weeks ago, I joined a large number of members of the Ukrainian American community that I proudly represent in the Ninth Congressional District to express support for those demonstrating in the still-colder winter in Ukraine.

As a founding cochair of the Congressional Ukrainian Caucus and original cosponsor of this resolution, I believe it is important that the House pass this expression of support for the Ukrainian people.

Those on Kyiv's Maidan and throughout the country need to know that the world is watching, that the U.S. is watching, that we here are watching, and we support them. I say to them, we are, and we do.

With colleagues, I recently had the privilege of meeting with opposition members of the Ukrainian Parliament. I was struck by what they indicated is their biggest fear and that of the demonstrators. There is the fear of riot police and government-backed thugs beating peaceful protesters, abhorrent behavior that has happened, resulting in numerous deaths.

There is a fear of being among the disappeared. According to reports, 20 opposition activists are still missing. What those brave democratic activists told us they are most afraid of is being forgotten, of the international community turning its attention elsewhere, of our global commitment to human rights and the rule of law being mere words, idealism overtaken by other foreign policy priorities.

The House today will take an important step to ensure that does not happen; that that fear is not realized.

Together with the Obama administration's continued forceful efforts, and the earlier passage of a similar resolution in the Senate, we present a unified American front. We show the people of Ukraine that we will steadfastly support their democratic and European aspirations.

We show Ukrainian President Yanukovich that America will not sit on the sidelines in the face of their government repression and gross human rights violation, and, as the Obama administration has shown, America will not only condemn, we will take action.

Like others, I welcomed the State Department's revocation of visas held by Ukrainian Government officials found to be responsible for violence against peaceful protesters.

I encourage the administration to take additional action, including targeted financial sanctions, should violence and human rights violations continue, which is what this resolution calls for.

It is time for the Government of Ukraine to immediately cease the use of violence, recognize the human rights of peaceful protesters and independent media, and participate in a true national dialogue with the opposition.

I urge all of my colleagues to stand and stand up with the courage, resilience, and indomitable spirit of the

Ukrainian people and pass this resolution.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), a very distinguished member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 447. As the tensions continue to rise in Ukraine about the future direction of this country, we understand that the people of Ukraine are hoping to secure basic democratic freedoms of association and speech for all citizens.

I join my colleagues in stressing the importance of the adoption of democratic social norms in Ukraine and in the region.

Over the past several years, we have seen some impressive improvements in the area of human rights. However, the situation for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender individuals continues to cause serious concern. The rampant and unacceptable state-sponsored homophobia that we are witnessing in neighboring Russia is slowly invading Ukraine as well.

Some individuals have sought to introduce legislation in the Ukrainian Rada, similar to Russia's, to ban so-called "homosexual propaganda," which does nothing more than limit the fundamental freedoms of association, speech, and assembly for all Ukrainians, regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity.

The citizens of Ukraine, including her LGBT citizens, deserve much, much better, and they should know we stand with them as they pursue a free, inclusive, and democratic society.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, how much time do I have?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the cochair of the Ukrainian Caucus, an original cosponsor of this resolution, and she and I had the opportunity many years ago to travel together to Ukraine.

□ 1815

Ms. KAPTUR. I want to thank Ranking Member ELIOT ENGEL of New York for his great leadership and Chairman CHRIS SMITH of New Jersey for bringing this vitally important resolution up tonight.

Madam Speaker, I rise to express my support for House Resolution 447, supporting the courageous democratic aspirations of the people of Ukraine. I want to thank, on a bipartisan basis, Congressman JIM GERLACH of Pennsylvania for his cochairmanship of our

Ukrainian Caucus. We all stand in solidarity with the people of Ukraine.

The people of Ukraine have the human right to choose their own future, free of intimidation and fear. What courage it took for these interfaith religious leaders at Maidan to stand with their religious symbols, icons, and crosses and other religious garb, along with their leaders, with their backs to the barricades, protecting the students as they faced the police.

Over the past few months, the world has stood witness as Ukrainians have risen up, united in their desire for a more free, transparent, and democratic Ukraine. If one knows anything about the history of Ukraine, one knows what it took to do that in that place.

The passage of House Resolution 447 here this evening means that our Congress stands in solidarity with those in Maidan and that we lend our support to the hundreds of thousands of Ukrainians peacefully demonstrating in the freezing, bitter subzero temperatures for over 2 months for a more democratic and better future for all their people.

If there is a God—and I believe there is—surely he or she will look down on this place and bless these people.

The Ukrainian national anthem opens with the words:

Ukraine's glory has not yet died, nor her freedom; upon us, fellow compatriots, fate shall smile once more.

Indeed, fate shall smile once more upon Ukraine. Long live Ukraina. Long live her young people who hold in their hearts the democratic future of that nation.

Madam Speaker, I urge the passage of H. Res. 447. I say to my colleagues here, this is a most important crossroads in history. Truly, this country can be the borderland nation that links West and East and South and North in that important part of the world.

The world needs Ukraine. She is already the third-largest grain exporter to the world's people. Her talent, her artistry, her vision has been quashed for so many, many, many decades and generations. Now is her moment, and we stand with her people, aspiring to that better day for all.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I just want to take 30 seconds to respond and thank the gentlelady from Ohio for her very eloquent defense of the Ukrainian people and for, again, reminding Americans and the world of the pivotal role that the patriarch and the highest, as well as people who are just among the faithful, are playing.

The religious community is standing in solidarity with those who are aspiring for freedom, democracy, and respect for human rights. And they have literally put themselves between the police and the barricades in a way that puts their very lives at risk, holding up crosses, holding up other, as the gentlelady said, icons of faith to say that we serve a God of peace and reconciliation.

Ms. KAPTUR. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds, and I yield to the gentlewoman.

Ms. KAPTUR. I would just say to the gentleman, looking back at the history of Ukraine and that region, the fact that you would have leaders of the Jewish faith, leaders of the Islam faith, leaders of Christian faiths, be they Orthodox or Uniate or Roman Rite, all—all—risking their substance, it is just incredible.

This should be on the front page of every newspaper in the world, and world opinion should move progress forward and help those people who have stood in that bitter cold weather for over 2 months. Unless you have traveled to Ukraine and experienced those temperatures yourself, you would not fully appreciate what they are enduring.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

I am glad you brought up the interfaith aspect of this as well. I actually chaired another hearing on anti-Semitism just several months ago, and the chief rabbi from the Ukraine came and testified and gave very powerful testimony as to how the faith community is working side by side to mitigate and, hopefully, end the cruelty of anti-Semitism while simultaneously working with Christians and others on behalf of human rights.

Again, this demonstration of the faith community should go noted by everybody in this Chamber and, I hope, by everyone in the world.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), a very distinguished member of both the Budget and Ways and Means Committees and a member of the Ukrainian Caucus as well.

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Speaker, I thank both Mr. ELIOT ENGEL of New York and Mr. CHRIS SMITH of New Jersey for leading us through what are important things for us to contemplate, because what is applicable to Ukraine is applicable to a lot of places in this world. So I am a proud cosponsor and a strong supporter of H. Res. 447. It expresses our solidarity with the Ukrainian people and affirms their right to choose their own future.

In this room, not that many years ago, we brought in the Prime Minister. Many of us had these flags, the colors of the Ukraine country.

Mass protests have broken out in Ukraine following President Yanukovich's decision in November to back away from negotiations for closer integration with Europe. So Russia has their fingers in all of this. Beware.

There was an agreement which had been supported by millions of Ukrainians in Ukraine and around the world.

We have known about the violence. We have known about the detainment because folks just expressed their legitimate dissatisfaction with Yanukovych's government.

However, the current crisis in Ukraine had deeper roots. Almost a decade ago, the Orange Revolution led to the annulment of a fraudulent election which would have brought Viktor Yanukovych to power. In the wake of protests and civil disobedience on a massive scale, the Ukrainian people, instead, chose President Viktor Yushchenko and Prime Minister Yulia Tymoshenko. She is in jail. She is in jail right now, as we speak, still. Now the democratic gains made as a result of that Orange Revolution are at risk. Viktor Yanukovych has gained the presidency, and former Prime Minister Tymoshenko, as I said, is still in jail.

The use of force to suppress open expression by political opponents or popular protests could never be tolerated in a free and democratic society, and those within the Ukrainian Government who authorized these brutal crackdowns should be held accountable for their egregious abuse of power.

There has been a strong outpouring of support for the protesters from the large and active Ukrainian American community, many of whom live in my district, the Ninth Congressional District of New Jersey.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. PASCRELL. Ukrainian Americans deeply desire a solution to this crisis which respects the fundamental rights of their sisters and brothers in Ukraine to free speech, press, and peaceful assembly. It is my sincere hope that the United States can facilitate a peaceful resolution to the crisis in Ukraine which respects the will of the Ukrainian people and brings justice to those who have been harmed through wrongful arrests and violence.

As we saw in Syria, crackdowns on nonviolent protests can lead to an all-out civil war, and we still do not do what we should be doing with those refugees from Syria. That is a disgrace.

We need to act now to help the people of Ukraine before the violence escalates further. I urge my colleagues to join this vital show of support from the American people to the people of Ukraine.

I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) for yielding.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I want to continue to urge my colleagues to support the resolution. As anyone can see, this is a very bipartisan resolution. It is very important.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I, again, thank my good friend and colleague from New York, ELIOT

ENGEL, for his sponsorship of this important resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. KEATING. Madam Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong support for H. Res. 447, a resolution supporting the democratic and European aspirations of the Ukrainian people and their right to choose their own future free of intimidation and fear.

As an original co-sponsor and as Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Europe, Eurasia, and Emerging Threats, I believe it is essential for Congress to continue to show its strong support for the Ukrainian people. In the two decades since Ukraine gained its independence from the Soviet Union, Congress has been at the forefront of efforts to foster democratic and economic reform in Ukraine.

I have been deeply troubled by developments in Ukraine since President Yanukovych's surprising announcement last November that his government would not sign an Association Agreement with the European Union. I remain concerned that Mr. Yanukovych and his government were unduly pressured by outside forces to take a decision at odds with the long-term interests of the Ukrainian people and that the government's decision was not taken in consultation with other political stakeholders.

Since November, I have watched Ukraine's unfolding political crisis with growing concern, especially authorities' use of violence against peaceful protestors. I have been deeply dismayed by the deaths and injuries sustained on all sides. I applaud the Administration's decision to revoke the visas of the Ukrainian government officials who were responsible for ordering or committing acts of violence against peaceful protestors. I believe additional sanctions should be considered in the event of further violence, but hope they will not be necessary.

In the past few weeks, we have started to see signs of progress toward a resolution, including the repeal of repressive measures adopted by parliament in mid-January and the resignation of the prime minister and his cabinet on January 28. Both developments created an opening for serious dialogue between the government and the opposition. I urge all parties to seize this important opportunity.

This resolution does not take sides in what is quite rightly a matter that Ukrainians must decide for themselves. Instead, it urges all parties to refrain from violence and to engage in constructive, sustained dialogue in order to find a peaceful solution to the current crisis.

To facilitate that process, this resolution underscores to protestors, to the government, and to all Ukrainians that the United States will continue to defend Ukraine's sovereign right to chart its own course and build its own future.

It also makes clear, not just to the protestors, but to President Yanukovych as well, that the United States will continue to support the Ukrainian people's aspirations to build a strong and prosperous democracy—one that is firmly rooted in Europe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 447, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Motions to suspend the rules on H.R. 2431 and H. Res. 447, in each case by the yeas and nays, and the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

NATIONAL INTEGRATED DROUGHT INFORMATION SYSTEM REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2431) to reauthorize the National Integrated Drought Information System, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 365, nays 21, not voting 45, as follows:

[Roll No. 55]

YEAS—365

Andrews	Camp	Crowley
Bachmann	Cantor	Cuellar
Bachus	Capito	Culberson
Barber	Capps	Cummings
Barletta	Carney	Daines
Barr	Carson (IN)	Davis (CA)
Barrow (GA)	Carter	Davis, Rodney
Barton	Cartwright	Delaney
Bass	Castor (FL)	DeLauro
Beatty	Castro (TX)	DelBene
Becerra	Chabot	Denham
Benishek	Chaffetz	Dent
Bentivolio	Chu	DeSantis
Bera (CA)	Cicilline	Deutch
Bilirakis	Clark (MA)	Diaz-Balart
Bishop (GA)	Clarke (NY)	Dingell
Bishop (NY)	Clay	Doggett
Black	Cleaver	Doyle
Blackburn	Clyburn	Duckworth
Blumenauer	Coble	Duffy
Bonamici	Coffman	Duncan (SC)
Boustany	Cohen	Edwards
Brady (PA)	Cole	Ellison
Brady (TX)	Collins (GA)	Ellmers
Brooks (AL)	Collins (NY)	Engel
Brooks (IN)	Conaway	Enyart
Brownley (CA)	Conyers	Eshoo
Buchanan	Cook	Esty
Bucshon	Cooper	Farenthold
Burgess	Costa	Farr
Bustos	Cotton	Fattah
Butterfield	Courtney	Fincher
Byrne	Crawford	Fitzpatrick
Calvert	Crenshaw	Fleischmann

Fleming	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Rooney	NOT VOTING—45	Denham	Kinzinger (IL)	Price (NC)
Flores	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Ros-Lehtinen	Aderholt	Dent	Kirkpatrick	Quigley
Forbes	Lummis	Roskam	Amodei	DeSantis	Kline	Rahall
Fortenberry	Lynch	Ross	Bishop (UT)	Deutch	Kuster	Rangel
Foster	Maffei	Rothfus	Braley (IA)	Diaz-Balart	Labrador	Reed
Fox	Maloney, Carolyn	Roybal-Allard	Brown (FL)	Dingell	LaMalfa	Reichert
Frankel (FL)	Maloney, Sean	Ruiz	Campbell	Doggett	Lamborn	Renacci
Frelinghuysen	Marchant	Runyan	Capuano	Doyle	Lance	Ribble
Fudge	Marino	Ruppersberger	Cárdenas	Duckworth	Langevin	Rice (SC)
Gabbard	Matheson	Ryan (WI)	Cassidy	Duffy	Lankford	Richmond
Gallego	McAllister	Salmon	Connolly	Duncan (SC)	Larsen (WA)	Rigell
Garamendi	McCarthy (CA)	Sánchez, Linda T.	Cramer	Duncan (TN)	Larson (CT)	Roby
Garcia	McCarthy (NY)	Sanchez, Loretta Sanford	Davis, Danny	Edwards	Latta	Roe (TN)
Gardner	McCaul	Sarbanes	DeFazio	Ellison	Levin	Rogers (AL)
Garrett	McClintock	Scalise	DeGette	Ellmers	Lipinski	Rogers (KY)
Gerlach	McCollum	Schakowsky	DesJarlais	Engel	LoBiondo	Rogers (MI)
Gibbs	McDermott	Schiff		Enyart	Loeb sack	Rokita
Gibson	McGovern	Schock		Eshoo	Long	Rooney
Gingrey (GA)	McIntyre	Schrader		Esty	Lowenthal	Ros-Lehtinen
Goodlatte	McKeon	Schweikert		Farenthold	Lowe	Roskam
Gowdy	McKinley	Scott (VA)		Farr	Lucas	Ross
Granger	McMorris	Scott, Austin		Fattah	Luetkemeyer	Rothfus
Graves (MO)	Rodgers	Scott, David		Fincher	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Roybal-Allard
Grayson	McNerney	Serrano		Fitzpatrick	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Ruiz
Green, Al	Meadows	Sessions		Fleischmann	Lummis	Runyan
Griffin (AR)	Meehan	Sewell (AL)		Fleming	Lynch	Ruppersberger
Griffith (VA)	Meeks	Shea-Porter		Flores	Maffei	Ryan (WI)
Grimm	Hahn	Sherman		Forbes	Maloney, Carolyn	Salmon
Guthrie	Hall	Shimkus		Fortenberry	Maloney, Sean	Sánchez, Linda T.
Hahn	Hanabusa	Shuster		Foster	Marchant	Sanchez, Loretta
Hall	Hanna	Simpson		Fox	Marino	Sanford
Hanabusa	Harper	Sinema		Frankel (FL)	Matheson	Sarbanes
Hanna	Hastings (FL)	Sires		Frelinghuysen	McAllister	Scalise
Harper	Hastings (WA)	Slaughter		Fudge	McCarthy (CA)	Schakowsky
Hartzler	Heck (NV)	Smith (MO)		Gabbard	McCarthy (NY)	Schiff
Hastings (FL)	Heck (WA)	Smith (NE)		Gallego	McCaul	Schneider
Hastings (WA)	Hensarling	Smith (NJ)		Garamendi	McClintock	Schock
Heck (NV)	Herrera Beutler	Smith (TX)		Garcia	McCollum	Schrader
Heck (WA)	Higgins	Moran		Gardner	McDermott	Schweikert
Hensarling	Hinojosa	Southerland		Garrett	McGovern	Scott (VA)
Herrera Beutler	Holt	Stewart		Gerlach	McHenry	Scott, Austin
Higgins	Honda	Stivers		Gibbs	McIntyre	Scott, David
Hinojosa	Horsford	Swalwell (CA)		Gibson	McKeon	Sensenbrenner
Holt	Hoyer	Takano		Gingrey (GA)	McKinley	Sessions
Honda	Huffman	Terry		Gohmert	McMorris	Sewell (AL)
Horsford	Huizenga (MI)	Thompson (CA)		Goodlatte	Rodgers	Shea-Porter
Hoyer	Hunter	Thompson (MS)		Gowdy	McNerney	Sherman
Huffman	Hurt	Thompson (PA)		Granger	Meadows	Shimkus
Huizenga (MI)	Issa	Thornberry		Graves (MO)	Meehan	Shuster
Hunter	Jeffries	Tiberi		Grayson	Meeks	Simpson
Hurt	Jenkins	Tierney		Green, Al	Meng	Sinema
Issa	Johnson (OH)	Tipton		Griffin (AR)	Messer	Sires
Jeffries	Johnson, E. B.	Titus		Griffith (VA)	Mica	Slaughter
Jenkins	Johnson, Sam	Tonko		Grimm	Michaud	Smith (MO)
Johnson (OH)	Jordan	Tsongas		Guthrie	Miller (FL)	Smith (NE)
Johnson, E. B.	Joyce	Turner		Hahn	Miller (MI)	Smith (NJ)
Johnson, Sam	Kaptur	Upton		Hall	Miller (TX)	Smith (TX)
Jordan	Keating	Valadao		Hanabusa	Miller, Gary	Southerland
Joyce	Kaptur	Van Hollen		Hanna	Miller, George	Stewart
Kaptur	Pearce	Vargas		Harper	Moore	Swalwell (CA)
Keating	Pelosi	Veasey		Harris	Moran	Takano
Kelly (IL)	Perlmutter	Vela		Hartzer	Mullin	Terry
Kelly (PA)	Peters (CA)	Velázquez		Hastings (FL)	Mulvaney	Thompson (CA)
Kennedy	Peters (MI)	Visclosky		Hastings (WA)	Murphy (FL)	Thompson (MS)
Kildee	Peterson	Wagner		Heck (WA)	Murphy (PA)	Thompson (PA)
Kilmer	Pittenger	Walberg		Hensarling	Nadler	Thornberry
King (IA)	Pitts	Walden		Herrera Beutler	Napolitano	Tiberi
King (NY)	Pocan	Walorski		Higgins	Negrete McLeod	Tierney
Kinzinger (IL)	Polis	Walz		Himes	Neugebauer	Tipton
Kirkpatrick	Pompeo	Wasserman		Hinojosa	Nolan	Titus
Kline	Posey	Schultz		Holding	Nugent	Tonko
Kuster	Price (GA)	Waters		Holt	Nunes	Tsongas
LaMalfa	Price (NC)	Waxman		Honda	Nunnelee	Turner
Lamborn	Quigley	Weber (TX)		Horsford	O'Rourke	Upton
Lance	Rahall	Webster (FL)		Hoyer	Olson	Valadao
Langevin	Rangel	Welch		Hudson	Owens	Van Hollen
Larsen (WA)	Reed	Wenstrup		Huelskamp	Palazzo	Vargas
Larson (CT)	Reichert	Whitfield		Huffman	Pallone	Veasey
Latta	Renacci	Williams		Huizenga (MI)	Pascrell	Vela
Levin	Rice (SC)	Wilson (FL)		Hunter	Paulsen	Velázquez
Lipinski	Richmond	Wilson (SC)		Hurt	Payne	Visclosky
LoBiondo	Rigell	Wittman		Issa	Pearce	Wagner
Loeb sack	Roby	Wolf		Jeffries	Pelosi	Walberg
Long	Roe (TN)	Womack		Jenkins	Perlmutter	Walden
Lowenthal	Rogers (AL)	Yarmuth		Johnson (OH)	Perry	Walorski
Lowe	Rogers (KY)	Yoder		Johnson, E. B.	Peters (CA)	Walz
Lucas	Rogers (MI)	Young (AK)		Johnson, Sam	Peters (MI)	Wasserman
Luetkemeyer	Rokita	Young (IN)		Jordan	Peterson	Schultz
				Joyce	Petri	Waters
				Kaptur	Pittenger	Waxman
				Keating	Pitts	Weber (TX)
				Kelly (IL)	Pocan	Welch
				Kelly (PA)	Poe (TX)	Wenstrup
				Kennedy	Polis	Westmoreland
				Kildee	Pompeo	Whitfield
				Kilmer	Posey	Williams
				King (IA)	Price (GA)	Wilson (FL)

NAYS—21

Amash	Hudson	Petri
Bridenstine	Huelskamp	Poe (TX)
Broun (GA)	Jones	Ribble
Duncan (TN)	Labrador	Sensenbrenner
Gohmert	Lankford	Westmoreland
Graves (GA)	Massie	Woodall
Holding	Perry	Yoho

Messrs. POE of Texas and RIBBLE changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. WILSON of Florida changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING THE DEMOCRATIC AND EUROPEAN ASPIRATIONS OF THE PEOPLE OF UKRAINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MEADOWS). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 447) supporting the democratic and European aspirations of the people of Ukraine, and their right to choose their own future free of intimidation and fear, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 381, nays 2, not voting 48, as follows:

[Roll No. 56]

YEAS—381

Amash	Brooks (IN)	Cleaver
Andrews	Broun (GA)	Clyburn
Bachmann	Brownley (CA)	Coble
Bachus	Buchanan	Coffman
Barber	Bucshon	Cole
Barletta	Burgess	Cohen
Barr	Bustos	Collins (GA)
Barrow (GA)	Butterfield	Collins (NY)
Barton	Byrne	Conaway
Bass	Calvert	Conyers
Beatty	Camp	Cook
Becerra	Cantor	Cooper
Benish	Capito	Costa
Bentivolio	Capps	Cotton
Bera (CA)	Carney	Courtney
Bilirakis	Carson (IN)	Crawford
Bishop (GA)	Carter	Crenshaw
Bishop (NY)	Cartwright	Crowley
Black	Castor (FL)	Cuellar
Blackburn	Castro (TX)	Culberson
Blumenauer	Chabot	Cummings
Bonamici	Chaffetz	Daines
Boustany	Chu	Davis (CA)
Brady (PA)	Cicilline	Davis, Rodney
Brady (TX)	Clark (MA)	Delaney
Bridenstine	Clarke (NY)	DeLauro
Brooks (AL)	Clay	DelBene

Wilson (SC) Womack Yoder
Wittman Woodall Young (AK)
Wolf Yarmuth Young (IN)

NAYS—2

Jones

Massie

NOT VOTING—48

Aderholt Gosar Neal
Amodeli Green, Gene Neom
Bishop (UT) Grijalva Pastor (AZ)
Braley (IA) Gutiérrez Pingree (ME)
Brown (FL) Hultgren Rohrabacher
Campbell Israel Royce
Capuano Jackson Lee Rush
Cárdenas Johnson (GA) Ryan (OH)
Cassidy Kind Schwartz
Connolly King (NY) Smith (WA)
Cramer Kingston Speier
Davis, Danny Latham Stivers
DeFazio Lee (CA) Stockman
DeGette Lewis Stutzman
DesJarlais Lofgren Webster (FL)
Franks (AZ) Matsui Yoho

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1907

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, on February 10, 2014, I was unavoidably detained attending to representational activities in my congressional district and thus unable to return in time for rollcall votes 55 and 56.

Had I been present I would have voted as follows: on rollcall No. 55 I would have voted “aye” (February 10) H.R. 2431—The National Integrated Drought Information Systems Reauthorization Act (Representative HALL—Science, Space and Technology); On rollcall No. 56, I would have voted “aye” (February 10) (H. Res. 447, Supporting the democratic and European aspirations of the people of Ukraine and their right to choose their own future free of intimidation and fear, as amended 2319, Native American Veterans’ Memorial Amendments Act of 2013 (Representative ENGEL—Foreign Affairs).

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker’s approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 241, noes 123, answered “present” 1, not voting 66, as follows:

Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Capps
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Clark (MA)
Clay
Cleaver
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (NY)
Conyers
Cook
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Grayson
Griffith (VA)
Grimm

Guthrie
Hahn
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Huelskamp
Huffman
Hunter
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Levin
Lipinski
Loebbeck
Long
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nunnelee
O’Rourke
Olson

[Roll No. 57]

AYES—241

Payne
Pelosi
Perry
Petri
Pocan
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda
T.

Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thornberry
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Vargas
Wagner
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Womack
Yoho
Young (IN)

NOES—123

Amash
Andrews
Barber
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bishop (NY)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Burgess
Chaffetz
Chu
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Costa
Cotton
Crowley
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DeSantis

Gardner
Gerlach
Gibson
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Griffin (AR)
Hall
Hanna
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kilmer
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Lance
Langevin
LoBiondo
LoRee
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCaul
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
Miller, George
Moore
Mulvaney
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
Nugent
Palazzo
Pallone
Paulsen
Pearce
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Gohmert

NOT VOTING—66

DesJarlais
Doyle
Franks (AZ)
Gingrey (GA)
Gosar
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hultgren
Hurt
Israel
Jackson Lee
Johnson (GA)
Keating
Kind
Kingston
Latham
Lee (CA)
Lewis
Lofgren
Matsui
McCollum
Neal
Neom
Owens
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Perlmuter
Pingree (ME)
Richmond
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Royce
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Schwartz
Sinema
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stockman
Stutzman
Tiberi
Vela
Yarmuth

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1913

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today regarding my recent absence from the House on Monday, February 10. On this day, I was unavoidably detained in my district.

Because of this absence, I missed votes on the House floor. I would have voted “aye” on rollcall Nos. 55, 56 and 57.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, due to being extremely sick, I was not present for tonight’s rollcall vote No. 55, No. 56, and No. 57. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on rollcall votes 55, 56, and 57.

GARETH PREBBLE, A ROLE MODEL

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Gareth

Prebble, a sixth-grade student from Mount Nittany Middle School in State College, Pennsylvania. Gareth has hopes of connecting what he refers to—and rightfully so—as the divide between the physically disabled and the rest of the population.

Young Gareth took a giant step towards this goal last month when he entered the Martin Luther King Commemoration Student Showcase essay contest. The contest, sponsored by Pennsylvania State University, is titled “Reflect on Yesterday. Experience Today. Transform Tomorrow.”

Gareth, who has cerebral palsy, wrote about his life experiences: “People often look at me and make assumptions based on my appearance.” Gareth’s essay evokes Dr. King’s powerful message—for all people in this country to be treated with respect and dignity.

Mr. Speaker, Gareth went on to win this competition. I rise to congratulate him for his work and for having the strength and courage to share his story. In doing so, he is a role model for each and every one of us in how we, too, can transform the future.

TUCSON GEM AND MINERALS SHOW

(Mr. BARBER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute the Tucson Gem and Mineral Society, which next week will host the 60th annual Tucson Gem and Minerals Show.

This show began as a small club gathering, and over the past six decades, it has grown to set the standard for other such events around the world. This year’s show will be held from February 13 through 16 with the theme “60 Years of Diamonds, Gems, Silver, and Gold.”

As a result of the interest generated by this long-running event, dozens of satellite events very much like it have proliferated throughout the Tucson area. These feature gems, minerals, fossils, meteorites, and other items from around the world and are known as the Tucson Gem, Mineral and Fossil Showcase. These events bring an estimated \$100 million to southern Arizona.

None of this would have been possible without the work of the volunteers of the Tucson Gem and Mineral Society. I am proud to recognize this long-time Tucson tradition and this great organization and the economic benefits it brings to my district.

TAXMAN STEALS THE GOLD, SILVER, AND BRONZE

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, America’s best athletes carry the ban-

ner of Old Glory into the Olympic Games. They are a remarkable breed and have dedicated their lives in training to represent Team USA in lands far, far away.

This year is no different as they hit the snowy Winter Games in Russia, and they are already doing quite well. As the “Star-Spangled Banner” plays, they stand on the podium to receive gold, silver, and bronze medals—but lurking in the creepy shadows of the medal ceremony is the U.S. taxman.

The IRS wants a piece of the gold even though these medals were won overseas. It is absurd that the IRS can levy a tax on these medals. These athletes are ambassadors for America. Their medals should not be taxed by the IRS. Are some winners going to have to sell their medals to pay the taxman? Who knows?

Congress should pass Congressman FARENTHOLD’s legislation this week that would keep the greedy hands of the IRS off the medals of the Olympians.

Mr. Speaker, the taxman should not be able to steal the gold, silver, and bronze.

And that’s just the way it is.

OLYMPIAN EDDY ALVAREZ

(Mr. GARCIA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize a Miami native and Cuban American short-track speed skater, Eddy Alvarez.

When I first heard about this south Florida ice speed skater, I was even more astounded than when I found out about the Jamaican bobsled team. Disney may have to make a movie about this. In all seriousness, Eddy had his first competition in Sochi this morning, and he will continue competing in events this week.

Eddy learned to roller skate in south Miami, and then took to the ice, eventually competing internationally with great success. I am proud to note that Eddy attended Christopher Columbus High School and practiced at the Kendall Ice Arena—both great institutions in my district.

Eddy is a remarkable example of American determination and dedication. I wish him and his fellow Olympians all the success in Sochi.

ENDING RUSSIA’S BAN ON INTERCOUNTRY ADOPTION

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, as millions of Americans turn their attention to Sochi for the Winter Olympics, we cannot overlook Russia’s continued ban on intercountry adoption.

Every day, families across America eagerly await news that the Russians’

ban on allowing American families to adopt Russian children has finally ended. Some families have decided to look at other places to adopt, but many are still committed to completing their adoptions. Families like the Thomases, from Minnetrista, Minnesota, have not given up hope in adopting their second child from Russia. In 2008, they completed an adoption for their son Jack. After a successful transition, they have now begun the process of adopting Jack’s younger brother, Nikolai. Unfortunately, Russia’s adoption ban has squashed any hopes of completing that adoption.

Mr. Speaker, every child, no matter where he is born, should have the opportunity to grow up in a loving family. I urge my colleagues to continue fighting to end the Russian adoption ban and to let our families bring home their children.

IN CELEBRATION OF THE LIFE OF PATRICIA McNAMARA BEAZLEY

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the life of a great American, Patricia McNamara Beazley, a magnificent woman and citizen whom we laid to rest today in Toledo, Ohio, after a mass at Gesu Church, a place that she called home.

Pat Beazley was an extraordinary human being. The minute you met her you felt like a member of her family. She was an artist of family, a dedicated wife, mother, grandmother, great-grandmother, and an artist in her own right. Her paintings abound not just in her home but throughout our country and, certainly, in her home community.

Her son, Michael—a personal friend—her daughters, her grandchildren, her great-grandchildren, and her wonderful husband, Ben, just know that our entire community stands with you. We know what a builder of family and community Pat was. We celebrate her life—her life of love, her life of contributions to others, her very quiet way of building friendships and, in so doing, building a community that was strong—her church family, her community of artists and, obviously, her own family.

We say “thank you” to the Beazley Family for sharing Pat with us these many, many decades. We have been so blessed by her presence, and the beauty of her life and the beauty of her works will remain with us always. May she rest in peace, and may God give comfort to those who remain behind to carry forward her legacy.

[From: Toledo Blade]

Patricia Beazley, 83, an award-winning artist known for her skill in portraiture and in depicting family scenes and children, died Wednesday in her Sylvania Township home.

Mrs. Beazley developed complications after a series of strokes the last few years, her son, Michael, said. Mrs. Beazley and her loving, surviving husband, Ben, raised three

gifted children—Michael, Mary Beth and Trish. Their grandchildren & great grandchildren pay tribute to their lifetime of love and devotion.

Pat was an artist in every sense of the word. She accepted commissions and she created formal portraits, such as of professors and administrators at the University of Toledo and Ohio State University. Families commissioned her to depict a mother with a baby or a montage of family scenes. On occasion, she was asked on short notice to do a portrait that could be displayed at a wake or funeral service. She created the familiar picture, "Daughter Too," of the pig-tailed girl eating an apple on the side of Al Peake & Sons & Daughter Too produce trucks.

"Her biggest strength as an artist was she really captured the likeness," her daughter Mary Beth said. "A friend of hers stopped by and said, 'She captured the spirit.'"

Mrs. Beazley worked primarily in pastel, though she was versed in other media.

"She enjoyed anything from the still lifes to the flowers," her son said. "Her line of pencil drawings she used to call 'captured moments.' She always took joy in the craft and a special pride in the reactions of the families she did work for."

Her work has been selected for the annual Toledo Area Artists Exhibition at the Toledo Museum of Art and for a Pastel Society of America exhibition and has been included in other shows at the museum and through the Athena Art Society and other groups. She received a Grumbacher Bronze Medallion, and at several exhibitions, her works were deemed best-of-show.

Her mother was an amateur artist, but Mrs. Beazley did not take an art class until she was 39. She actively resisted training as a child, she told *The Blade* in 1981, because "I just knew I wasn't good enough."

She also was active at Gesu Church and volunteered for the League of Women's Voters—she produced a public television program featuring debates among local candidates—and on behalf of civil rights.

She'd painted a mural on the kitchen wall when the family lived in Chicago. She began sketching.—See more at: <http://www.legacy.com/obituaries/toledoblade/obituary.aspx?n=patricia-beazley&pid=169562150&sthash.VEUvWBOk.dpuf>

A "CLEAN" DEBT CEILING: A DIRTY DEAL FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Mr. BARTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, sometime in the very near future, we are going to have to vote on an increase in the national debt. The national debt ceiling is currently at \$17 trillion, and all expectations are that the increase will put it up over \$18 trillion or at least \$17.5 trillion.

It is unconscionable to me that one of the largest items already in our budget is the interest on the national debt, and that it is also one of the fastest growing items in the budget. I will not vote, Mr. Speaker, for a so-called "clean" debt ceiling, because I think that is a dirty deal for the American people.

It is time to begin structural changes to our entitlement programs that make them subject to some sort of caps so that we can get back to balance and

keep our budget in balance. This is one of those inflection points in American history, and I hope that the House of Representatives will insist on real reform in our budget before we vote to increase the public debt by one penny.

MIAMI-DADE TEACHER OF THE YEAR MYRNA BETANCOURT

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am so pleased tonight to rise to congratulate a Miami teacher who is going above and beyond for our south Florida students.

Myrna Betancourt, a culinary arts teacher at the South Dade Educational Center, is Miami-Dade County's 2015 Teacher of the Year.

Working out of her kitchen in the Chapman Partnership Homeless Center in Homestead, Myrna is giving hundreds—thousands—of often disadvantaged, special needs or homeless Miami students a second chance at life. A former social worker and public school teacher, Myrna has always wanted to help those in need. Thanks to her hard work, Myrna's chefs are learning to cook gourmet foods, are finding jobs in good restaurants, and are receiving scholarships at the finest culinary schools in our country. More importantly, Mr. Speaker, Myrna is giving them hope and an opportunity to follow their dreams.

Congratulations, Myrna. South Florida is also very proud of you.

CONGRATULATIONS WALLA WALLA VALLEY

(Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take time to recognize the beautiful Walla Walla Valley and the 30th anniversary of their Federal designation as an American Viticultural Area.

Over the past 30 years, the Walla Walla Valley has earned national and international recognition for being one of the best wine regions in the world. Just ask Gary and Nancy Figgins, who opened Leonetti Cellar in 1984 when there were just four wineries in the valley. Today, within 1,800 acres of green, rolling hills, you will find 130 different wineries.

This growth has allowed businesses to expand and the wine tourism to become one of the top industries in our State. Our community has rallied around the business owners, and now wine-related jobs account for nearly 15 percent of the total jobs in the area. All of this leads to a \$500 million economic impact, but it is not just the numbers, as it is about a community that makes us all proud in Washington State to call it our home.

I am honored to represent the Walla Walla Valley, and congratulations on

30 exceptional years. Best wishes for many, many more to come.

□ 1930

SHAME ON YOU

(Mr. GOHMERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, today, once again, the President has unilaterally, almost like a monarch, said ObamaCare is the law.

The fact is HARRY REID and the Senate were willing to shut down the government instead of just passing a bill that would have suspended ObamaCare for a year—or, at least suspend the mandates—and he did it again today.

So it makes it very clear the shutdown of our government that hurt so many people was clearly a political game by HARRY REID and the Senate Democrats because they wanted America to hurt—and blame the Republicans—when all along they were willing to agree to what we offered to avoid the shutdown.

Shame on you.

CONFLATING THE TERMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEBER of Texas). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives. I have a number of things that I would like to bring to your attention that are on my mind and I think are on the minds of the American people.

The number one topic in this Capitol Building, at least on the House side right now—and I believe on the Senate side, too—is the question of the debt ceiling that has been brought forward. A lot of us have some memories of how difficult that was the last time that came through.

There are a good number of Members in this Congress that have pledged they will never vote to increase the debt ceiling. We have a President who used extraordinary methods the last time and stretched the debt ceiling out and the crunch time that was supposed to come for months. And it is curious that even though the Congress did backfill that debt ceiling for him, now he doesn't have any extraordinary means, evidently, and now we are up against the time line, up against the wall of perhaps a February 15 date. It causes this Congress to have to scramble.

It is not because this government is in risk of default, Mr. Speaker. That is the language that emerged 2 or 3 years ago on the debt ceiling. Republicans and Democrats alike talked about how this country's credit is good and we can't allow our government to default.

The definition of default really isn't what has been used in this dialogue

over the debt ceiling. The default would be if the United States could not and failed to service its debt. That would be if we didn't have the revenue stream to pay the interest and to roll the bonds over, then we would be in default. We are a long, long way from that, Mr. Speaker. We have, by some measurements, as much as 8 or 9 or 10 times the revenue necessary to pay the interest and roll the bonds over.

So America is not in danger of default, but we are in danger of getting confused about the debate and losing track of the essence of it because we allow language to be conflated in the minds of the American people, the minds of the people in the House and the Senate, and in the press. The press allows that to happen as well. And when language gets conflated, we lose the center of the argument.

To drive that point home, Mr. Speaker, I would say this. About 6 or 7 years ago, I noticed that the language was being conflated between health care and health insurance. I recall our then-Governor to the State of Iowa came here in this very building. We had a meeting with the Iowa congressional delegation and the Governor, and he pressed us around the table, seven of us at the time—five House Members and two Senators—and he said, There are 40,000 kids in Iowa that don't have health care.

No one said anything. I looked at him and I said, Governor, there can't be 40,000 kids in Iowa that don't have health care. We are taking care of those kids. Why have I not heard about kids without health care?

He said, No, there are 40,000 kids in Iowa without health care.

And I brought it back to him again. They all have access to health care. If nothing else, in the emergency room they are going to have access to health care. We would not turn a child away—not from a clinic, not from a hospital, not from an ER.

And we went around and around five or six times with that verbiage of the Governor saying 40,000 kids don't have health care and me saying that can't be true, hoping that I could get him to be the guy that figured out that he really meant health insurance, not health care.

I had to explain it to him, Mr. Speaker. There is a difference. What you really mean is there are 40,000 kids—at the time—in Iowa that didn't have their own health insurance policy, which is far different than not having health care.

But you see what has happened. The language was already conflated in his mind and he couldn't separate them apart, even at a meeting with the Iowa congressional delegation where he was pitching for more resources to go into the program.

And so if that happens in the mind of a Governor of the State of Iowa, I have to believe it happens in the minds of a lot of other people across the country. And then I have to wonder, did this

happen by accident? Did the language get conflated by accident, or were there people that wanted to advance a policy and they decided we are going to conflate this language because it helps our liberal agenda?

Well, it is the latter. It helps the liberal agenda to conflate the language. They did so on health insurance and health care, and that is just a model.

The next piece of this would be the example that happens with immigration.

Now, we know that there is a difference between illegal immigrants and legal immigrants. There is a tremendously different moral underpinning of this. I don't know anyone in this Congress that isn't very supportive of legal immigrants. And all of us who took an oath to uphold the Constitution should be for enforcing the rule of law even as they set about trying to change it.

But the term "immigrant," which connotes a legal immigrant, and the adjective "illegal" immigrant are entirely different. They have been conflated, because when you use the term "immigrant" interchangeably with "illegal immigrant," it suits the argument of the people who are for the open borders lobby and for amnesty.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, they have intentionally conflated the terms so that they can move their agenda, because it makes it harder to debate the distinctions if you have to stop and define the difference between "immigrant" and "illegal immigrant."

And then, of course, they argue that we shouldn't use that terminology—even "illegal immigrant." We should use "undocumented" or "not yet granted amnesty." Oh, wait. That wouldn't be theirs, Mr. Speaker. But you get the point. You conflate the terms "illegal immigrant" and "immigrant," and then you give the moral standing of the immigrant to the illegal immigrant; and then you can make the argument that you should grant them amnesty because somehow they should have access to American citizenship and all the benefits thereof.

It is a similar argument that comes along with "health care" and "health insurance." By conflating the two terms, they convinced the American people—at least a significant number of them—that everybody has not only a right to health care, but everybody has a right to their own health insurance policy.

These are a far cry from what our Founding Fathers laid out as rights. And, by the way, they are even a far cry from what Franklin Delano Roosevelt laid out as the four new freedoms. When I go down and look at the Roosevelt monument, it gives me a bit of a creepy feeling thinking how he manufactured freedoms that didn't come from God but fit a liberal agenda—even then.

So we have got the terminology of "health care" and "health insurance" and "immigrant" and "illegal immigrant" conflated, and now we are in

the debt ceiling debate, and people on both sides of the aisle are arguing that we can't allow the United States to default. Their definition of "default" is the moment that the United States runs out of borrowing capacity, which isn't the same, because the cash flow still comes flowing in, hundreds of billions of dollars a month, which is plenty of money to service the interest and to pay the debt.

We are not up against a hard break here, Mr. Speaker. We are not up against a deadline that says that if we can't get credit at the bank, we are going to have the house foreclosed on. That is not it at all. It is a matter of where we take the money from to service our debt and what bills we pay.

I do think that the inertia of the spending and the structure of the budget that we have pushes this Congress towards a debt ceiling increase at some point. But the House of Representatives has the majority of Republicans for a reason. It is because the American people rose up in 2010 and said, You are shoving too much government on us. We want to keep our God-given liberty. We want to reject ObamaCare. We want to have a smaller government with less taxes and less spending and less regulation, less intrusion, less nanny state, more freedom, more God-given liberty.

That is what the American people said in 2010.

They reiterated it again in 2012 with regard to the House of Representatives. And with the President, Mr. Speaker, they evidently decided that they wanted a President that would perhaps send them an Obama phone and maybe pick up the rent check and the heat bill and the grocery bill without that much responsibility.

I don't know that the American people were looking down the line to see that if they push this debt off into the next generation, it is their children and their grandchildren that will be paying the debt in the next generation.

When I go to a high school and talk to the high school students, invariably they will say to me, What are you going to do about the cost of tuition and what are you going to do about the cost of my student loan?

They are planning to go to college, and I am glad they are.

The answer to that and the answer I give them is, The best thing that can be done for the increasing cost of tuition is for you, the consumer, to make an astute choice on where you will go to school and the best education you can get for the tuition dollar. Calculate that. Go visit the schools. Don't think that you are going to pay a premium because you want a certain kind of sheepskin hanging in a frame on the wall someday and believe that you can put your feet on the desk and live happily ever after.

The world doesn't work that way. Not that often, in any case, Mr. Speaker.

Instead, go evaluate the tuition costs and the cost of housing and all of the

associated costs with a college education and bargain for the best buy that you can get, and go there and get that education.

If you are determined that you want a degree from a prestigious institution, you can start a 4-year degree there. Maybe you will spend 5 years getting that degree. Or you can go to a smaller institution that is maybe closer to home and a little cheaper, get a couple years in, maybe a third year in, and transfer to that 4-year school. You can achieve that degree and put it in the frame with less dollars and maybe get more back in return for the tuition dollar.

Be good consumers is the piece advice that I would give to the students looking at going to college. That is one of the educational components of where we are going with this country. But the debt that is there for an individual is the debt of the country in its aggregate.

When I tell the students that this is how you get the best buy for your dollar, they say, What are you going to do to buy down the interest rate on my student loan?

My answer to that is, If we do that, we have to borrow the money here in Congress from maybe the Chinese, maybe the Saudis, maybe the American people. About half of this U.S. debt, this \$17.3 trillion, is held in the hands of the American people in the form of Treasury bonds, et cetera. And so if we have to borrow the money to buy down your interest rate, you are going to be the one paying it back. You get your college education; you go off into the workforce; you start paying down the interest and the principal on your student loan; you are the one paying it back. If we borrow the interest rate down now, you still have to pay back your student loan, maybe at a lower interest rate, but you are going to be paying back the national debt as the other part of that bargain.

I have a number of grandchildren, all of them tremendous gifts and miracles in their own right, but the most recent two are the ones that I happened to have actually kept the math on. My little granddaughter Reagan is 3 years old. When she came into the world, her share of the national debt was \$48,000.

□ 1945

Little Wallace, the youngest, who has been here since, oh, back in mid-November, his share of the national debt when he came into the world was \$54,000. Three years apart. If we are gifted with another grandchild, you know their share of the national debt is going to be greater and greater.

This Congress needs to understand and think about our duty to the succeeding generations. Maybe it is an easy enough thing to pass a debt ceiling increase here to pacify a President who refuses to take on entitlement reform.

We all know that this debt is out of control. The spending is out of control.

The spending is on auto-pilot, and the spending is going into programs like Medicaid and Medicare and Social Security.

By the way, the latter of the three is the one that is the easiest to fix, and if we could get our employment up, we could get Social Security back on track easier than any other way. The reform of entitlements is a necessary thing if we are ever going to get this country to balance.

So the question emerges to me and others, Mr. Speaker: What would you attach to a debt ceiling increase, a debt ceiling increase that would satisfy the President which, apparently, would be an entire year, a credit card for an entire year at whatever limit that might be? What would you attach to that to send the message, to hang on to something that you can point to and say, I focused on fiscal restraint?

What could be that list of items?

Well, one would be, and my Number 1 item, Mr. Speaker, that I would attach, and this would get me to vote for a limited debt ceiling increase, would be this: a balanced budget amendment to the United States Constitution passed out of the House of Representatives, passed out of the United States Senate, messaged to the States.

I would step up and take a real good look, depending on the terms of it, of course, at voting for a debt ceiling increase under those conditions.

Now, the balanced budget amendment to our Constitution would have to include, in my view, it would need to include a cap on the GDP spending. I would cap it at 18 percent.

Another would be that we would have to be able to waive that balanced budget requirement in the case of a declared war, and we have got some language, or a very serious national emergency. Those would be some provisions.

No tax increases without a supermajority, another provision.

A balanced budget amendment to the United States Constitution that enforces fiscal responsibility from this point forward, provided that the States would ratify that constitutional amendment.

Now, Congress could pass a balanced budget amendment out of here with a two-thirds majority, out of the House and out of the Senate and message it to the States. That is all that we can ask out of here. The States then pick the balance up from there.

Meanwhile, a debt ceiling increase would pass, I believe, out of this Congress, and the 38 States required to ratify a balanced budget amendment, I believe they would step forward and do that, because, after all, they do have balanced budget requirements within their Constitutions, almost all of them, a balanced budget requirement, and we see how they live within their means.

I worked in the State senate in Iowa for 6 years. We made our way to balance the budget sometimes when it was painful, but we knew we had no choice and, therefore, you carve that budget to match. You live within your means.

Tax increases come hard. In fact, we have reduced taxes, not increased taxes. Now we have a surplus.

I mentioned the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution as a requirement before we could vote for a debt ceiling increase. I don't know if that appetite exists here in this Congress.

I make the point to you, Mr. Speaker, because I think more need to think about the merits of a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

Another component that we could attach to a debt ceiling increase would be a requirement to audit the Fed. Now, that is something that has had a lot of signatures on it here in the House of Representatives. When Ron Paul served here in the House, he pushed that constantly. Yes, we have passed it out of the House of Representatives in the past, and they don't have an interest in taking it up in the Senate.

We don't know what is going on in the Fed. There are trillions of dollars that are maneuvered around over the course of years, and we aren't able to take a look at those dollars, and our job is oversight.

So when you give the Fed, essentially, an open checkbook and they can inject funds into the economy, and they can run the throttle on our economy up and down without congressional oversight, without even having access to that information to see what they are doing—the closest we get to auditing the Fed is to read *The Wall Street Journal* that picks up little tidbits and writes it into the newspaper, that gives us a better feel of what is going on.

Thanks to *The Wall Street Journal*, Mr. Speaker, but that is not enough. We do need to audit the Fed. It is a no-brainer from where I sit. Congress has an oversight responsibility. We should do so, and we should not be inhibited or held back.

It is too bad that something as simple and as clear, with the kind of support that auditing the Fed has, you would even have to think about attaching it to a debt ceiling increase in order to try to get that done and get a Presidential signature.

The President doesn't want Congress to know what is going on in the Fed, and he will resist this.

There has been a consistent pattern, Mr. Speaker, of the Majority Leader in the United States Senate being a shield for the President of the United States.

Each time we move an idea that is a good idea from the voice of the American people—by definition, when it comes out of this Congress it is the voice of the American people by virtue of the republican form of government, which is guaranteed to us in the Constitution, I might add, Mr. Speaker.

But the Majority Leader in the Senate puts up the shield if the President doesn't want to see it on his desk. Then the debate stops because the President of the United States has a blocking agent, the Majority Leader in the United States Senate.

So here we sit in the House making argument after argument, as I am doing tonight, Mr. Speaker, arguing for a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, arguing that we should audit the Fed, arguing that raising the debt ceiling without restraints feeds spending and accelerates the accumulation of debt.

By the way, you just heard a few minutes ago, Mr. GOHMERT talk about the President, again, altering or amending his own bill, ObamaCare.

Now, think of this. I came here an innocent neophyte who just simply studied and read this Constitution for a good number of years, and carried one in my pocket longer than I have been in this Congress. Each day that I had a jacket I kept it in my jacket pocket, and the times that I was in the Iowa senate, and that is getting to be a few years ago now, Mr. Speaker.

When I took an oath to uphold this Constitution, and I actually remember where I was sitting right over there when that took place the first time here, and I never imagined that article I responsibilities that give the authority for legislation to the Congress would be so usurped by the President of the United States.

Article I, section 1, all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, there is no mention in this Constitution about the President involved in legislation. It says all legislative powers herein granted.

Well, where do these powers come from?

They come from God, granted to the people, and we, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, established this Constitution of the United States of America, and all legislative powers are vested in the Congress.

Article I, not article II or article III, this Federal Government, this contractual guarantee called the Constitution of the United States, was put together with the first respect for the people of the United States of America and the laws that they would ask to be passed through their republican form of government, their representatives here in the House and in the Senate.

Yet, the President, who gave a lecture a couple of years ago, on March 28, I remember the date—it might have been 2011—at a school just here in Washington, D.C., at a high school, and he was talking about the Constitution.

Now, remember, Mr. Speaker, that the President is a former adjunct law professor who taught constitutional law at the University of Chicago, a very highly respected and revered school, especially their law school, and their school of economics as well.

I have great respect for the people who have gone through law school at the University of Chicago. I have met a good number of them, and the ones that I have met, they have been smart,

they have been good people. They understood the Constitution. They had good judgment.

Some of them were in the classroom—I circled by six or seven of them one evening—in the classroom of Barack Obama when he was teaching constitutional law, and they told me that each time that they reverted back to the clear letter of the Constitution, the clear meaning of the Constitution, that Adjunct Professor Obama would stretch it out and turn it over into an activist interpretation.

It is pretty interesting to hear that, but this President knew what he was doing when he spoke to the high school here in this city, March 28, I believe, 2011. He said, you are good students; you know this. The Congress writes the laws, and I am the executive branch, so my job is to see to it that the laws are enforced, and then the courts interpret the laws.

Pretty clear. That is what he said. It was an accurate interpretation of the Constitution, of articles I, II and III of our Constitution. He knows the Constitution, he has taught it.

In spite of that, Mr. Speaker, he steps forward and violates his own oath of office and seeks to legislate by executive edict. I don't use that first word, executive order, Mr. Speaker, because occasionally it is an executive order, but sometimes it is a press conference; sometimes it is the President's people, on a third-tier U.S. Treasury Web site, announcing that there has been some change in Federal policy that effectively amends Federal law.

Now, Presidents are required to take their oath of office, it is in this Constitution, by the way, and inclusive within that oath is the Take Care Clause, that the President's obligation is to take care that the laws be faithfully executed. That is a component of the oath that he gives when he swears in out here on the west portico of the Capitol on January 20, every leap year. We hear that oath.

So when the President of the United States doesn't enforce the laws that have been passed by the Congress, messaged to a previous President, signed by a previous President, and go into the Federal Code, when the President doesn't enforce those laws, if he says he disagrees with the laws that have been passed before he arrived at the west portico and took the oath of office, that is a constitutional violation. That is a violation of his oath of office. That is the reason that he takes it, is so we can compel him to follow the Constitution.

This President not only has refused to enforce the laws that were on the books when he became President—and it is multiple cases. The President has refused to enforce the law when it comes to Welfare to Work. There is only one component of the 80 different means-tested Federal welfare programs that we have that requires work.

That was the big deal that emerged during the mid-nineties, when we had

Welfare to Work, and there were two or three vetoes by President Clinton, who finally took credit for signing Welfare to Work.

Only one of the 80 requires work, and that one the President willfully, simply disregarded, and so he ended Welfare to Work. After all of the bare-knuckle fights here in this Congress and the vetoes and the Presidential positioning and the politics that went into it, President Obama just wiped out Welfare to Work, willy nilly, even though it was written carefully so that a President couldn't ignore the work component of Welfare to Work and the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families component of welfare. That is one violation.

Then we had the President just simply set aside No Child Left Behind. That was Teddy Kennedy's piece that he negotiated with George W. Bush. President Obama decided I don't like No Child Left Behind, kicked that one off the table. I am going to ignore it, and you all can ignore it because I, essentially, direct you to.

Then we get to the immigration component of this, and there are five pieces of the—we call it the Morton Memos, where the President has decided that he is refusing to enforce existing immigration law, and they argue that it is on an individual basis only.

There were seven different references to an individual basis only by Janet Napolitano, who testified before the Judiciary Committee. That is in there, Mr. Speaker, so that they can argue that it is not creating a class of people that are now exempted from the law. Well, they create classes of people and they exempt them from the law.

That is the immigration piece of the violations. Now it brings me to ObamaCare, and on ObamaCare, I can't keep track of the times that he has decided that he is not going to enforce ObamaCare and he is going to change it or amend it. The list is so full at this point I don't know if anyone has memorized how many violations, how many changes that have come to the ObamaCare law because of the President's executive edicts that come down.

I would lay the foundation of this, Mr. Speaker, in the passage of ObamaCare itself, and in the Stupak amendment, and I would like to take that discussion up in a moment.

□ 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I am slightly mystified by that. But in any case, I will try to be aware of that comment.

To take us back to ObamaCare, Mr. Speaker, as I said, I would be happy to pick it up at this point. So we have a President who was, of course, involved in the negotiations with the passage of ObamaCare, and the question became

whether they could put the votes together to pass it here on the floor of the House of Representatives because it was clear to us that ObamaCare was going to fund abortions. So what emerged from that was a group of Democrats known at the time as the “Stupak dozen,” who conditioned their support for the bill upon a provision, which became the Stupak amendment, that would prohibit abortions funded under ObamaCare or required under ObamaCare.

Well, as that debate ensued, the message became clear that the White House was negotiating that the President would simply sign an executive order that amended ObamaCare after it passed, after the fact, and that would fix the Stupak problem. That is the shorthand version, Mr. Speaker, of what took place.

But in any case, it was a bit breath-taking to hear that we had a President in the White House who believed that he could sign an executive order to amend legislation after the legislation passed and announce that he was going to do so, which was a condition for it to get the votes in order for it to pass.

Now, I know that there are people at home that are listening, Mr. Speaker, to whom that sounds like a lot of legalese gibberish, but it is the fact of what happened. The President, according to the press, had promised that he was going to amend ObamaCare by executive order after the fact; so, therefore, the Stupak language would remain in tact, even though it was to be stripped out in the Senate. That is essentially what happened, Mr. Speaker, and we ended up with ObamaCare that imposes funding of abortion in all but a very few cases.

To give an example, here in the House of Representatives, we are compelled to sign up for ObamaCare. If there was a way out of it, I would have found it. And there were 112 different programs to look at. And of those, there were only nine that didn't fund abortion; and of those nine, eight of them didn't cover me. So it came down to this Member was compelled to sign up for ObamaCare, pay essentially the doubling of my contribution to the premium, and it was the tripling of my deductibles for the only policy that, at least reportedly, didn't fund abortion.

Now, we had to dig pretty deeply. And I thank the gentleman from New Jersey, CHRIS SMITH, for digging that up and giving us at least that much foundation, or I would have had to buy a pig in a poke, Mr. Speaker. I know that is going on across the country in many, many places.

But my point on this is that the President cannot constitutionally amend legislation by executive order, edict, press conference, or a third-tier Web site announcement from the Department of the United States Treasury. None of those things are consistent with the Constitution. And as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOMERT) said in his previous discussion,

in his 1-minute about a half-hour ago now, he continues to make alterations not to somebody else's legislation—that is bad enough. I mean, it is all the same kind of constitutional violation, in my view.

But when the President decides that he is going to amend ObamaCare that has got his name on it—that is his bill; he signed it—how can he, with a straight face, step up and say, I am going to change it on the fly; I am going to delay the employer mandate; I am going to delay the individual mandate; I am going to waive this; I am going to waive that; I am going to set different provisions for businesses that have 50 employees and those that have 99 employees and those that are large businesses?

And I remember also, when he stepped up in a press conference out at the White House after he had taken a couple weeks of grief for the conscience protection violations that were supposedly in the bill that Kathleen Sebelius' rules eliminated, and that was a requirement that religious organizations, as well, had to provide policies and insurance that covered contraceptives, abortifacients, sterilizations.

Contraceptives, Mr. Speaker, people understand. Abortifacients are abortion-causing drugs. Sterilizations, we know what these are. These were requirements in the rule embodied within the rule that HHS rolled out. And after 2 weeks of the religious organizations making the case against that, the President did his press conference at noon on a Friday, and he stepped up to the podium, and he said, I am going to make an accommodation to the religious organizations, an accommodation. They don't want to provide these things. So now, he said, I am going to require the insurance companies to provide these things for free.

The President of the United States had the audacity to step up to the podium and say, I am going to require the insurance companies now to fund contraceptives, abortifacients, and sterilizations for free.

Now, that is pretty interesting because maybe it just got lost in the language. Maybe the President was really talking about he was going to agree, and he was going to ask Congress if Congress would actually change the law. Maybe he thought that he was going to have Kathleen Sebelius publish a different rule that would go out for comment, and once it followed the administrative procedures, it could have the force and effect of law if it fit within the language of the ObamaCare legislation. Maybe, maybe, maybe, Mr. Speaker. Maybe we could give the President the benefit of the doubt.

Trust, but verify. So I went back and checked the rules, the rules that had been published, that compelled the religious organizations to follow the path of all of the others to provide for abortifacients and sterilizations and contraceptives, and the President's announcement that he was going to

change things now and make an accommodation to the religious organizations and require that these things be provided for free from the insurance companies. And you would think there would have been a proposal for an amendment, a bill to amend ObamaCare in Congress. You would think there would be a change in the rules. But, Mr. Speaker, nothing changed in the rules. There wasn't an “i” dotted differently. There wasn't a “t” crossed differently. But the insurance companies began to line up behind the verbal edict of the President. That is breathtaking in scope when you think of it.

When you read this Constitution where it says, “all legislative powers.” It doesn't say all legislative powers, except those assumed by the President under certain circumstances, if he so chooses. It says, “all legislative powers.” And yet the President is legislating by announcements on Web sites, by directing his people to change the rules, by verbal press conference that changed nothing, no rules. And he has the temerity to wave his pen at us and say, I have a cell phone, and I have a pen; I don't need the Congress—and to make that same statement from the rostrum back here, Mr. Speaker.

So I am very concerned about our Constitution and the violations of it. But the President has time after time after time made changes to ObamaCare. It is bad law, and I don't accept the constitutional decision that came down from the Supreme Court. It has got a clear and stark contradiction in it that one day I hope goes back to the Court to be reviewed again.

But in any case, we have got to adhere to this Constitution. We give an oath to uphold the Constitution, as does the President. It is our job to preserve, protect, and defend it.

And here we are, faced with a debt ceiling increase. And the reasons that we might be supportive of that increase are, in the short term, it gets people off the hook in the short term. But I want a balanced budget amendment attached to it. If we don't get that, let's audit the Fed. If we don't get that, then I would say, here is something we all ought to get behind: eliminate the bailout of our insurance companies.

Our insurance companies wrote into ObamaCare that they would be protected from a stop-loss, essentially protected from loss if their actuarial numbers and their premiums don't match up.

Now, it would be impossible for them to figure this out because the President has been changing this law all along. Most all of the changes have been unconstitutional. I would bet the clearest one would be when the President of the United States decided that he was going to extend the employer mandate for a year.

Now, the law that was signed by President Barack Obama says that the employer mandate shall commence in each month after December of 2013.

That means it must start January 2014. We should be in the second month of the employer mandate. And I am happy enough for the policy to change. I don't think it ever should be implemented. If they bring that extension to this Congress, I would vote for an extension to delay the employer mandate for a year because that is probably the right kind of policy.

We didn't get that before this Congress. Instead, the President just announced he was going to extend it. And I happen to have been on a bit of a trip when the notice came that he was going to do some delays of the individual mandate, and I remember sending an email off to one of the top insurance companies, Is anybody there talking about the constitutional violations? The answer that came back was, Well, not very much. But, yes, he is sure they are talking about them. My answer was, Merry Christmas.

This is what we get for Christmas, the President rewriting ObamaCare at will. It is ever-changing.

Months ago, a search of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show, Mr. Speaker, that I said nobody knows what the law is. Nobody knows what ObamaCare, the law ObamaCare is because it keeps changing. And of the thousands of pages of regulations that are piled on top of it, on the 2,700 pages of legislation altogether, it has been changed over and over again. Insurance companies can't abide by these changes. They can't adjust their premiums. And yet they wrote into the bill the risk corridors. And they say to me, But we have to have this because, after all, if ObamaCare is going to be here, we can't be going broke if the President changes the law on us again. That has kind of compressed the discussion.

And I say to them, Were you for or against ObamaCare when it passed? Their answer is, Well, hmm—they might check their shoe shine when they answer. And they will say, Well, our choice was either to be at the table or on the menu. So I am supposed to infer, and the proper inference is, they were at the table.

The large insurance companies in the country, they weren't just at the table; they were at the White House. They decided they didn't want to be on the menu, so they got to the table at the White House and they negotiated their risk corridors, their bailout that protects them from losing money under ObamaCare—or at least losing very much money under ObamaCare.

Well, if they weren't on the menu—they were at the table instead—who was on the menu, Mr. Speaker? And I would argue that, instead of the insurance companies being on the menu, it was the taxpayers that got put on the menu. And we ended up with risk corridors, the bailout for the insurance companies, because they wanted to stay in the large insurance business. And they believe that if they can get the taxpayers to fund the premiums, it is a more reliable premium funding

stream than if you have to get that from the individual ratepayers; and also, it was designed to put 30 million more people on the insurance roles.

So whoever is in the business of expanding their business and trying to get a margin—and I have not been an anti-insurance person. I have paid a lot of premiums and have stepped up and done so willingly. They are an important component of the stability in a free enterprise economy. All insurance is, as a matter of fact.

But when they drew that protection and wrote that protection in—the stop-loss protection called risk corridors—the bailout for the insurance companies into ObamaCare, somebody was going to pick up the tab. That is the taxpayers. It expanded their potential universe to 30 million more insureds, 30 million more premiums. And, of course, there is a profit margin in that, and that is what they are in the business of doing.

Well, you expand the premiums to that 30 million, and the design that came out of ObamaCare was that we were going to see more insured. And at this point, I would lay the wager down, Mr. Speaker, that there are fewer people insured today in this country than there were the day that ObamaCare was signed into law, and we are losing people continually. And as we see what employers are going to do as they watch this, the employer mandate kick in over time—delayed now—more employers are going to be dropping people from insurance. More employers are cutting hours. More employers are reducing the number of employees.

I happen to know of an employer that had 58 employees, and he lined them up and said, If ObamaCare is passed into law and implemented, there will be 49 of you, not 58.

That had to have happened all across the country, businesses that shrunk down to under the 50 mandate, businesses that decided not to grow into that 50 employees where they are mandated to cover their insurance.

□ 2015

That is the fact of this life if you have more than those in employees, and then the formerly 40-hour workweek, which has been used to measure a full-time worker, was reduced under ObamaCare to 30 hours—30 hours, not 40. So we ended up with people that are getting 28 hours, that are working 28 hours a week so they are underneath the mandate, and the employer then who can't afford the premiums often for the higher cost health insurance can keep his employees on.

So here are the circumstances. There might be somebody that has got a job, and they could be working let's just say about 48 or 50 hours a week, a little overtime, time and a half overtime on that—I have done the math on this, Mr. Speaker—but running in at about 50 hours a week. The employer looks at that and says, I can't afford the health insurance. This Federal mandate is ei-

ther going to take me out of business or I am going to have to lower your hours.

So he looks at his full-time employees and says, sorry, you are part time. You are 28 hours, you are 28 hours, you are 28 hours. Well, he needs more employees to fill up the production. So he goes and hires more part-time workers. Well, that is a good thing for some people, but those who had a full-time job and were getting time and a half overtime and they get their hours cut, the person who was working 50 hours now is down to 28, they have to go get another part-time job that maybe is another 28 hours. Now they are up to 56 or 60 hours, but they don't have health insurance with two jobs. Maybe that is dad, and mom is the same circumstance. She has been cut. She has got to have another job.

So now we have mom and dad trying to raise a family when each were working 50 hours a week with some overtime, now they are working 56 hours a week in two jobs with transportation and the shuttle of schedules, four jobs for two people to raise a family.

Those circumstances are emerging today under ObamaCare, Mr. Speaker, and it is wrong. We need to raise that minimum, that 30-hour standard for full time, that mandate up to 40. That is an essential component of ObamaCare. I would attach that to the debt ceiling. Any one of these, one at a time, all together, I'm fine with, a 40-hour workweek.

Another one, Mr. Speaker, is this, full deductibility for everyone's health insurance premium. It has always been wrong that a certain percentage of the American populace has had to buy their health insurance with aftertax dollars. I have done this for years. As an employer, I started a construction company in 1975. I provided health insurance for our employees, but I couldn't deduct the premium for me unless I incorporated, put myself on a salary and wrote off those wages. I wanted to stay a sole proprietor for a number of reasons, but I couldn't deduct my health insurance premiums.

I would write off the business expense of premiums for my employees, a legitimate expense just like wages, salary, and benefits, write those off. But I couldn't write off my own. So Marilyn and I had to pay for health insurance with aftertax dollars, that piece that is left after you pay Uncle Sam, after you pay the Governor, the take-home pay so to speak. After you pay the payroll tax, the take-home pay is what I had to pay my health insurance with—not a deductible.

Now, here we are in the circumstance where that is bad, and it should have been changed a long time ago because it is an injustice and an inequity, but now we have ObamaCare that mandates that individuals buy that health insurance. It is a Federal mandate: you shall buy this health insurance. Now, in my case, it isn't that I go out on the marketplace and shop for a health insurance policy. It is that if I am going

to comply with the law, I have got one choice and one choice only, and that is not competition. By the way, one of the reasons that the President wanted to pass ObamaCare is so that there would be more competition. He wanted to have a Federal health insurance company to compete with the private sector companies so that there would be more competition. I don't know if anybody has talked about this in quite some time here on the floor. It is the President's plan.

Well, I had one choice, but to have the Federal Government impose that you buy a product that is either produced or approved by the Federal Government, and they take it out of your check. They commandeer your take-home pay to pay that premium. While that is going on, an employer somewhere off in a large corporation can deduct that same premium for all their people as a business expense. But ma and pa operations, the family farm, whoever it might be, they can't. It puts them at a significant disadvantage.

This country needs to provide for full deductibility of everybody's health insurance premiums. It is immoral to compel someone to buy a product that is produced or approved by the Federal Government, and it is even more immoral, Mr. Speaker, to say to them, and the money that you shall pay shall be aftertax dollars, and I am going to send the IRS in to audit you and make sure that you are paying that premium with aftertax dollars, and if not, we are going to levy a tax against you. It was just going to be a penalty, but now it is convenient to make the argument before the Supreme Court that it is a tax.

I have a whole series of things that we could do. The debt ceiling is in front of us. There is an increase that is being pushed at us. If the President's people in this Congress think a clean debt ceiling is a good idea, they should step up and all of them pledge to vote for it. I think we might find enough Republicans that would vote for a clean debt ceiling increase. If not, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest we put a balanced budget amendment on that and send it over to HARRY REID. If that doesn't work, then I would suggest that we resurrect Ron Paul's legislation to audit the Fed, attach that to the debt ceiling, and send it over there. If that doesn't work, then I would put the elimination of the bailouts for health insurance companies on there and send it over to the Senate. If that doesn't work, then I would take the 30-hour workweek, which is supposedly the standard for full time, I would change that to 40 so that mom and dad who were working 50 hours, and now they are working 56 hours or 60 hours each, can hang on to just one job, not two each, and they would get, instead of having their hours cut from 50 to 28, or maybe even 40 to 28, they can keep their full-time job and go to work and manage their lives and their schedules.

By the way, this argument that, according to the CBO, ObamaCare cuts

the job equivalent of 2½ million jobs over the course of a decade, that is also appalling and breathtaking, Mr. Speaker. To think that this ObamaCare that was going to create 4 million jobs according to then-Speaker PELOSI now is going to reduce by 2½ million jobs, that is 6½ million jobs off from what was predicted compared to what we now have a better look at what we are likely to end up with, and I won't say that number is certain, it might be substantially greater than that—2½ million jobs.

So how does the administration spin this? You would think that they would find an alternative number and argue the CBO score. Or you would think that they would find a way to point out that somehow these definitions don't quite match up just right. Oh, they looked around pretty hard to find a way to rebut the CBO's numbers and they came up empty. So they settled on the spin, the spin, Mr. Speaker, which is this: oh, 2½ million jobs, think of this: all of those people that don't have to work much because we are borrowing money from the Chinese to subsidize the health insurance premium that we require that they pay to buy the insurance under ObamaCare, and so they will understand that if they stay under a certain threshold, they will get a Federal premium subsidy to buy their ObamaCare. It won't pay for them to work as many hours as they did before, and when you reduce this all down and get people under the 30-hour workweek, which I just finished discussing, then they will have more time to spend with their families, more time to play with their children, more time to paint and more time to muse about the esoteric things in life. Maybe we will have more people that are pontificating about metaphysics for this price of losing 2½ million jobs. Oh, it is a good thing we have people working less in America.

That is the core argument for this administration: it is a good thing that we have people working less in America because of ObamaCare. It gives them more free time. Well, if working less is a good idea, I guess that fits with their philosophy, because we have heard, we have heard from the minority whip as well as a number of other people, in fact, I believe it would also be the former Speaker, who say this: Food stamps and unemployment are the two quickest ways you get economic stimulus, the quickest way to grow the economy.

Now, when I first heard that, it was shocking to me that anybody could say that out loud and perhaps believe it. How do food stamps stimulate the economy? How do unemployment checks stimulate the economy? An economy has to produce goods and services that have a marketable value here and abroad, and if you borrow money abroad to pay people not to produce goods and services, let alone those with a marketable value, you are building a nation of debt and a nation of people who, if they have job skills,

are atrophying because they are not using them, and as technology increases, they get further and further behind by not maintaining the skills they have and not keeping their skills up to date with technology as it moves.

This idea that this is only a consumer-driven economy, this Keynesian concept of let's just say we can't audit the Fed, but they can inject in QE 1, 2, and 3 trillions of dollars into this economy, and because a lot of the world is afraid to invest, therefore, we haven't seen inflation take hold in this way yet. But the Fed can inject the money into QE 3, and then the Federal Government can do an economic stimulus plan like the President's \$825 billion that went north of that, I guess it was \$787 billion that got to 825 billion, inject this money into the economy, spend this money, and it is going to stimulate the economy, and this growth will eventually create enough tax money that you work your way out of debt.

The problem with that is, Mr. Speaker, it has never succeeded. There is no existing model of a Keynesian experiment that has ever brought a country and economy out of an economic recession. We are in the fifth year of this recovery. I guess you can say that we are coming out of the economic recession of 2008. We have had this slow improvement in unemployment numbers that has taken place. We are down there in the sixes somewhere. We have watched as the number of 15 million unemployed has worked its way down by 1 million here, 1 million there. One year ago, there were 12 million unemployed. Today, according to the most recent report, there are 10.2 million unemployed. Actually, it has been a full 2 million people less on the unemployment roles. But the monthly job increases that we have seen, 74,000 last month, a little over 100,000 this month, are not nearly enough to keep pace, Mr. Speaker.

This growth has been down there to where if you look at the last 4 to 5 years, the GDP increase in the economy has been greater in Mexico than it has in the United States. As I listened to some of the, let me say some of the self-appointed economic experts, they will explain to us that we need to import more people into the United States that have low or no skill and likely are illiterate in their own language to do the work that Americans don't want to do in this country, and in doing so will stimulate our economy and increase our fertility rate. We know who those people are, Mr. Speaker, that seem to think that. Much of this concept is just simply wrong. Keynesian economics is wrong. The idea of an open borders economic stimulator is wrong.

What is right is the understanding of first principles, the understanding of the pillars of American exceptionalism, the understanding that put those parameters in place by our Founding Fathers well more than 200 years ago,

when they saw that we had to have the rule of law in America. Without the rule of law, we are not a lot different from Third World countries.

We are a nation of laws and not of men, and our laws need to be applied equally to all of us. The problem we have today is it looks like those who are let's say not favored by the current administration have to fear the law more than those who are favored. One of those examples would be the IRS, Mr. Speaker. Our Founding Fathers would have never envisioned an IRS in the first place. It took a constitutional amendment to even provide for it, the 16th Amendment. I introduce a resolution each year to repeal the 16th Amendment, and one day I hope to see that done.

In the meantime, our Founding Fathers imagined that there would be taxes gathered through other means and that the government would be limited. Our Constitution is the very description of limited government. The concept of Federalism, Mr. Speaker, sometimes needs to be defined and described, especially so young people understand. Federalism is the devolution of power out to the political subdivisions, to the States or respectively to the people, a limited Federal Government with enough power to protect our borders and our shores, to leave us as much as possible otherwise alone, and let the States and their political subdivisions and the people solve those problems so that the laboratories of the States can be where the experiments are taking place.

They are to some degree. I see some of these experiments. There are some States that have some healthy experiments. One of them is Texas: no income tax, a dynamic economy, one that has shown, that has demonstrated to be a big chunk of the growth in our GDP and the growth of employment in the country because they run a free and fair government in Texas and no income tax. Florida is a State with no income tax. South Dakota is a State with no income tax. They seem to be destination States for people that are seeking to get out of the high-tax States like Illinois and California, the model of the States that are in economic difficulty.

□ 2030

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, we have seen some cities that have been run by that Keynesian philosophy of borrow, tax, and spend get to the point of collapse and ruin, Detroit among them. Detroit, a great, great, American city with a tremendous legacy, a vibrant tone within the history of America, shuffled down into bankruptcy, and with grass growing in the streets of the city because they didn't take care of their finances. That is what is in store for entire States if they don't turn the corner, and that is what is in store for this entire country if we don't turn the corner.

I am concerned that politics here in the House of Representatives is down-

stream from the culture. Politics in any legislative body is generally downstream from the culture. Yes, we have leaders here. We have leaders that step up and strike the right tone and chart the right course, but they would not be followed unless the culture provided the directive.

This American experiment, this grand country that we are, is dependent upon the people in this country understanding what made us great, preserving and protecting and refurbishing those pillars of American exceptionalism that can sustain a greatness into the future, above and beyond any that we have achieved today.

That is what is in store for us if we teach our children well, if we teach them the responsibility of work, if we teach them the core of our faith, the faith that laid the foundation for America, the faith that will see us through any trials, the foundation for the family, the ideal way to raise children, a mom and dad and a family, raising their children with love and setting the standard for them, and setting the standard of work as well as morality.

This country can come back again. We need to teach American history, the pillars of American exceptionalism. We need to do it from inside out, from the family on out, and those young people need to emerge as the leaders in all walks of life from the educational to the journalism to the production, and we need to revere and respect all work. All work has honor. All work has dignity. We need to put a lot more Americans back to work. There are over 101 million Americans of working age who are simply not in the workforce. We don't need to import more people to do the work that Americans won't do. We need to provide the incentive for Americans to step up and shoulder the burden with the rest of us. That is more important.

So, Mr. Speaker, we will see how the debt ceiling unfolds. I have offered a number of options, and I appreciate your attention.

I yield back the balance of my time.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3193, CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION SAFETY AND SOUNDNESS IMPROVEMENT ACT; PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM FEBRUARY 13, 2014, THROUGH FEBRUARY 24, 2014; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. SESSIONS (during the Special Order of Mr. KING of Iowa), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-350) on the resolution (H. Res. 475) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3193) to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to strengthen the review authority of the Financial Stability Oversight Council of regulations

issued by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and for other purposes; providing for proceedings during the period from February 13, 2014, through February 24, 2014; and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS ADDRESSES RAISING DEBT CEILING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Missouri). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, once again it is an honor and a privilege to come to the floor of the House of Representatives and to anchor this Congressional Black Caucus Special Order in partnership with my coanchor, the distinguished gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD), where for the next 60 minutes members of the Congressional Black Caucus will have the opportunity to speak directly to the American people about an issue of great consequence and great significance for our country, for our economy, for our future, and for our well-being, and that is the debt ceiling.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a Yogi Berra moment. It is *deja vu* all over again.

Time and time and time again we have been forced to come to the floor of the House of Representatives and urge our colleagues on the other side of the aisle not to plunge this country into a painful default and risk the full faith and credit of the United States of America for the first time in the history of the Republic.

Whenever we have been forced to have this conversation, we are always put into a position where we need to clarify what the debt ceiling is really all about because it has been subject to a lot of misrepresentation. The debt ceiling is not a forward-looking vehicle that is designed to give the President the opportunity to spend more; it is a backward-looking vehicle designed to give the President the opportunity to pay bills that the Congress has already incurred: bills that were incurred during the previous decade, bills that were incurred during the 8 years of the Bush administration during which time our good friends on the other side of the aisle were in control of both the House and the Senate, and we will go into that in greater detail as we move forward.

Let's have an honest conversation about the realities that we face concerning the debt in this country, in excess of \$17 trillion. There is reason for us to be concerned about it, but let's not manipulate the facts as to how we got ourselves into this situation.

I am pleased that we have been joined by a very distinguished Member of the Congress and of the freshman class. In fact, we affectionately refer to him as the ranking member of the freshman class of the Congressional Black Caucus in the 113th Congress, and I am very pleased to yield to my good friend, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

Mr. PAYNE. I thank my colleagues, the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Nevada for their continued leadership on these CBC Special Orders. I am honored to join them once again on a topic that is paramount right now in our Nation's history, and also a situation that we must deal with in a manner to keep this Nation moving forward.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my friends on the other side of the aisle to do one simple thing. It is something that we expect from every American, and every person in this country expects it from us. That simple thing I am asking for, Mr. Speaker, is for Congress to pay our Nation's bills on time. There should be no resistance, no strings attached, no threats of default. Americans deserve better than to have the full faith and credit of the United States of America held hostage so that some of my Republican colleagues can demand ransom for their radical agenda.

Mr. Speaker, the full faith and credit of the United States is nonnegotiable, period. So I am urging this Congress to raise the debt ceiling swiftly and to do it with no strings attached.

Only recently in our Nation's history has the debt ceiling been used as a reckless bargaining chip. In fact, since the great hero of the other side, Ronald Reagan, took office, the debt ceiling has been raised 45 times. It is nothing new, and it is nothing radical.

Now the allegations put out there about what raising the debt ceiling will do to our deficit are misleading at best. The debt ceiling does not grow our deficit by one single dime. Rather, what it does is permit the government to pay what this Congress has already decided to spend. We had the credit card. We used the credit card. Now it is time to pay our Nation's bills and pay them on time.

So, Mr. Speaker, raising the debt ceiling is in fact the fiscally responsible thing to do here. If we default, the cost to American families will be significant: 26 million Americans won't get their Social Security checks on March 3. I will repeat that: 26 million Americans will not get their Social Security checks on March 3.

There are 1.5 million seniors, children, and disabled New Jerseyans who receive Social Security to help make

ends meet, and many of them will not see their checks if this is not followed through.

Nearly 4 million Americans may not receive their disability benefits, including 50,000 veterans in New Jersey. Now the other side of the aisle needs to take these things seriously. They talk about supporting veterans. They talk about supporting working families. They talk about all of these values, but if the debt ceiling is not raised, these families will not get the support and the benefits that they need to make ends meet. So, Mr. Speaker, it is incumbent upon the Members on the other side of the aisle instead of just talking the talk, walk the walk.

New Jersey families will have to pay higher interest rates for mortgages, auto loans, student loans, and credit cards. Many families in my district already can't afford to send their children to college. A default would put a college education even further out of reach.

I am hopeful that my Republican colleagues have learned their lesson from the last default threat in 2011 and from shutting down the government last year. The last time we threatened to default in 2011, the economy flew into a tailspin. Consumer confidence took a nosedive, and our credit rating was downgraded. Our economic recovery came to a screeching halt because of it. In an already fragile recovery, we cannot afford another possible meltdown of our economy.

So I am urging my Republican colleagues to help try and set an example, hoping that they have learned their lesson from last year, when they shut down the Federal Government. Let's pay our Nation's bills on time, Mr. Speaker. If we demand this kind of responsibility from the American people, then we should demand it from ourselves.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey for walking us through some of the episodes that the American people have been subjected to as a result of the extreme behavior that has been articulated and enacted, in fact, as part of the agenda put forth by the majority over the last two terms.

It is time, Mr. Speaker, to end the irresponsibility, end the recklessness, end the extremism, and end the brinksmanship so we can get back to doing the business of the American people with a fiscally responsible, sustainable course; but one that recognizes that here in this Congress, time and time again we have inflicted wounds on the economy and on the American people. We did it last spring in advance of sequestration taking effect. We were warned by independent economists that if you allow sequestration to take effect, \$85 billion in random cuts spread out without reason across the economy, it would cost us approximately 750,000 jobs, but yet it happened.

Then we were warned that it would be problematic if you allowed the gov-

ernment to shut down. Nonetheless, some people couldn't help the recklessness, the irresponsibility, the extremism, and so the government was shut down for 16 days. Standard & Poor's estimated that it cost us \$24 billion in lost economic productivity.

Yet here we are again, a Yogi Berra moment, *déjà vu* all over again, confronting an unnecessary, manufactured crisis. Just lift the debt ceiling, consistent with what has happened time and time again across Democratic and Republican administrations.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the co-anchor of the CBC Special Order, the distinguished gentleman from the Silver State, my good friend, Representative HORSFORD.

Mr. HORSFORD. I thank my good friend and colleague from the great State of New York, Mr. JEFFRIES, and for your leadership in anchoring this hour on behalf of the Congressional Black Caucus, and to bring the American people into a very important conversation about what the House of Representatives should be doing as you talked about tonight, and that is, Mr. Speaker, raising the debt ceiling and averting another crisis.

□ 2045

We are here tonight to urge our colleagues on the other side to work with Democrats and the administration to pass a clean and swift debt ceiling expansion without delay.

The Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Lew, emphasized in a letter to Congressional leadership last Friday that "no Congress in our history has failed to meet that responsibility," and "it would be a mistake to wait until the last possible minute to act."

Why should we act, Mr. Speaker? Why should we delay in acting? This Congress, unfortunately, being known as the "do-nothing" Congress, has failed to pass more bills than other previous sessions of Congress at a time when the American public expect their elected officials to work together to get things done. Under the leadership of the majority, fewer than 60 bills that have been passed by Congress have ultimately become law in the last year.

Now we are here facing yet another self-imposed, self-inflicted crisis. As my colleagues, Mr. JEFFRIES and Mr. PAYNE, have said, this is nonsense. The American public is looking at Congress and saying, Do your job.

The Treasury Department has made clear that it will exhaust all extraordinary measures in meeting our country's final financial obligations by February 27. The House—this House—is only in session for 5 more days between now and then, Mr. Speaker. That is why we are here to urge our Republican colleagues to act to raise the debt ceiling now, to do it swiftly, to do it without putting our country's full faith and credit of the United States at risk.

As my colleagues have said, we have to raise the debt, and it is not for negotiation. Let us remember that the debt

ceiling has been raised 45 times since President Ronald Reagan took office. It doesn't grow our deficit by a single dime. All it does is allow the Treasury to pay for what this Congress has already spent and the obligations previous Congresses have already made on behalf of the United States.

There has already been much talk about Speaker BOEHNER turning something that could be very simple into a hostage situation with sweeping concessions. I would hope that my Republican colleagues remember the damage that was caused the last time we debated increasing the debt ceiling. The fact that House Republicans are debating among themselves another demand to hold our full faith and credit of the United States hostage is outrageous.

As we stated before, Mr. Speaker, House Democrats agree with President Obama that the full faith and credit of the United States is nonnegotiable. I stand with House Democrats in support of a clean debt ceiling increase that ensures the full faith and credit of the United States of America and avoids having this Congress play political games and brinksmanship. We have said it before and we will say it again: we should be representing the people's best interest, not punishing them.

There are drastic implications to not passing this debt ceiling increase by February 27. I want to yield to my colleague, Mr. JEFFRIES, for us to be able to highlight some of these damaging consequences.

I know in my home State of Nevada, it would mean an average increase in mortgage rates, leaving the average home buyer to pay an additional \$100 a month, costing families \$36,000 over the lifetime of a typical 30-year mortgage. 85,267 Nevada residents took out a home mortgage or refinanced their existing mortgage in the past year. All of them would be subject to these increases in mortgage interest rates.

So this is just one example of one State and the families that would be impacted. This is the type of impact that would happen across our Nation. The consequences are real. It is time for our colleagues on the other side to stop playing games, increase the debt ceiling, and meet our obligations.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for pointing out some of the catastrophic consequences that the American people will be forced to endure if we fail to raise the debt ceiling and force a default and threaten the full faith and credit of the United States of America for the first time in the history of the Republic.

I just want to go over some of the things that would be at stake as a few of my colleagues have already laid out, but it bears reemphasis:

Social Security payments owed to the American people will be jeopardized by a failure to raise the debt ceiling;

Veterans benefits will be jeopardized by a failure to raise the debt ceiling;

Mortgage interest rates could increase as a result of a failure to raise the debt ceiling;

Automobile loan interest rates could increase as a result of a failure to raise the debt ceiling;

Credit card payments as a result of an increase in interest connected to debt that is held on American Express or MasterCard or Visa, or any of the other credit cards that the American people have, could increase as a result of a failure to raise the debt ceiling.

This is not an esoteric concept. This is something that will have a real impact on the American people. That is why we need a debt ceiling increase consistent with what every Congress and every American President has done since the founding of this country.

I want to read into the RECORD, and then perhaps have my good friend react to it, a Presidential letter that relates to this debt ceiling issue, and it reads in part:

This country now possesses the strongest credit in the world. The full consequences of a default—or even the serious prospect of default—by the United States are impossible to predict and awesome to contemplate. Denigration of the full faith and credit of the United States would have substantial effects on the domestic financial markets and the value of the dollar in exchange markets. The Nation can ill-afford to allow such a result.

This is a letter that was written on November 16, 1983, by President Ronald Reagan, addressed to then-Senate Majority Leader Howard Baker. President Reagan, I believe, my good friends on the other side of the aisle, have deified him as a “fiscal warrior,” a “true conservative.” Yet we know that Ronald Reagan raised the debt ceiling 18 times during his Presidency, and in this letter to Senator Baker lays out in bold, uncompromising terms the consequences of a failure to raise the debt ceiling.

This is not a partisan issue. We as Democrats are not standing here on the floor of the House of Representatives because we want to beat up the other side. We are here to defend the best interest of the American people—east, west, north, south, rural America, urban America, and suburban America—because the consequences of a failure to raise the debt ceiling will hurt everybody.

If the distinguished gentleman from Nevada could just react to the notion that this is somehow a partisan issue that needs to be discussed so that President Obama is being fiscally irresponsible by requesting that Congress do its constitutional duty.

Mr. HORSFORD. Thank you. I appreciate my good friend for yielding.

The remarks by the former President, President Reagan, speak to the reality of the consequence of Congress failing to act and what that will mean to our economy, to average Americans, to businesses, to the global economy because of the role that the United States plays, and to the value of the dollar, and to somehow hold this process hostage because Members on the

other side have still not come to terms that the election is over, the President won, and it is time for this Congress to work with him to move our country forward, not to use this as another means to extract more concessions or demands in order for you to do your job. You don't have to agree with President Obama on everything, but what you do have to do is your job on behalf of the American people that elected you.

While no one knows with certainty the full extent of the damage to the economy should the U.S. default on its debts—and we don't know because it has never happened because every other Congress, regardless of party, regardless of which party controls the White House or the administration on a given time, did its job to extend and raise the debt—what we do know is that the average American family will feel a significant negative impact.

We are not here to scare our constituents. Our constituents are going through enough every day trying to survive to make ends meet, to put food on the table, working hard for themselves and their families. But what we are here to do is to talk about what some of the potential impacts might be, so let me highlight that.

If you look for a moment at this chart, this graphic provides some explanation. What are the debt ceiling deniers missing?

Household wealth would increase by \$1 trillion if we fail to raise the debt ceiling.

Retirement assets would drop by \$800 billion at a time when people are trying to provide security for themselves and their future. A decision by this Congress to fail to raise the debt ceiling could result in \$800 billion of retirement assets declining.

We have talked about an increase in interest rates for borrowers at a time when our housing market is beginning to recover from the prolonged recession. Why would this Congress fail to act and the consequence of that result in increased mortgage rates for homeowners and borrowers?

And a huge hit, a huge hit, for financial markets around the globe causing the Dow Jones and the S&P to plummet. Families' retirement savings and 401Ks would drop as the stock market plummets.

3.4 million veterans who could not receive disability payments; 10 million Americans not receiving Social Security checks on time in just the first week alone; delayed tax refunds for up to 110 million Americans; and drug reimbursements under Medicare stopping and doctors and hospitals not getting paid, all for what? So that our colleagues on the other side who don't like the results of an election can use the debt ceiling as another attempt to get more concessions and more demands for things and ideas that have already been rejected by the American public.

□ 2100

So, Mr. Speaker, we are here to say enough is enough already. Let's get to work. Let's make 2014 a year of action, not obstruction. It starts by increasing the debt ceiling, by meeting our obligations and not doing harm to an already fragile economy and to an American public that expects its Representatives to act in its best interest, not in more political grandstanding or gamesmanship.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentleman for a very thorough explanation and for the illustration as it relates to the state of denial that, I think, some individuals within this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, or throughout the Capitol are in as it relates to the real consequences of a default and what it really means to threaten the full faith and credit of the United States of America.

Now, this denial syndrome is not really a strange concept. It is something that, unfortunately, I have had to familiarize myself with since being sworn in as a Member of Congress on January 3 of 2013.

Weather patterns are shifting. Global warming appears to me, based on the scientific evidence, to be a reality, yet there are people in this Congress who persist in denying that climate change is a reality. In advance of sequestration, notwithstanding the fact that independent economists warned that randomly spreading out cuts across the American economy, given the fragile nature of the economic recovery, would be a harmful thing and would threaten hundreds of thousands of jobs moving forward, there were people who denied that sequestration would be a tough thing for the American people to have to absorb. Yet, at the end of the year, wisdom prevailed because people saw that it actually was something that was problematic for the American people and our economy.

I guess, a long, long time ago, there were people who denied that the Earth was round, who believed that it was flat. So the denial syndrome is something that throughout time has been commonplace as it relates to individuals who want to articulate a particular agenda. I understand that, Mr. Speaker, but it is a dangerous game to play—to deny the reality of the catastrophic impact that would occur as a result of a default on our debt for the first time in our history. It would be another self-inflicted wound, as my distinguished friend from Nevada has indicated.

I was interested in a study that I came across a few days ago that I wanted to highlight and bring to the attention of the American people, and perhaps my colleague can react to it.

There is a new study, the Times reported, from the Peterson Institute for International Economics, a Washington, D.C.-based research group, that indicated that all of the theatrics—all of the drama, all of the brinksmanship—that occurred in this

Congress last year around the government shutdown and the potential debt ceiling default and whether we would be able to come together and reach an agreement—have cost us about \$150 billion in lost economic productivity. It shaved off about a percentage point in economic growth, and it may have cost us approximately 750,000 jobs. That is not our saying it; that is an independent research group, the Peterson Institute for International Economics. So there is a price to pay for the theatrics, and that is why we have come to the floor of the House of Representatives today to say we need a clean debt ceiling increase and that we need to do it now.

Secretary Lew has indicated that his ability to use extraordinary measures will run out by the end of the month. Mr. Speaker, I recognize that there are some on the other side of the aisle who are in disbelief as it relates to that statement. We have heard individuals make the representation that that can't be accurate. There is a logical reason why in this particular instance the capacity for the administration to use extraordinary measures to get us beyond the debt ceiling cap is only weeks in this particular instance and not months as it has been in the past. It is because the Treasury of the United States in February and in March and in April and, perhaps, even into May, returns a lot of money—billions of dollars—to the American people who have filed taxes and are owed money in connection with a tax return.

I believe that we would all conclude it is a good thing for the American people who are owed money by the Federal Government to be able to get that money back in return. That is why, in February, the capacity at this moment for extraordinary measures to be used is extremely limited. It is because we don't want to short-circuit the American taxpayer. It is bad enough that we are threatening to short-circuit Social Security beneficiaries or veterans and others, but now we are potentially risking withholding money from the American people that belongs to them. We hear that refrain all of the time, but that is what we are faced with right now.

Let me yield to my good friend, Representative HORSFORD.

Mr. HORSFORD. I thank my friend for yielding.

You bring up a very valid point.

Over the weekend, I was at the William Pearson Community Center in my district, which is a tax preparation site for the Las Vegas Urban League. It was packed. There was not a seat available because so many people were there, seeking assistance in order to file their annual tax returns, particularly this year. They were trying to get them done early so they could get the refunds that were coming to them so that they could then help meet an obligation that they have in their households. It has been tough for a lot of families.

So you make a very valid point as to the fact of the timing of this particular debt ceiling increase and the February 27 date and the obligations that the country has and this time period in particular. There are 110 million Americans who will be filing their tax returns, many of whom will be getting a refund, and I don't think they will take kindly to a delay in that refund if our colleagues on the other side use this debt ceiling legislation as an opportunity to load it up with conditions and requests that have nothing to do with the debt ceiling issue.

I would ask my colleagues on the other side to listen to their constituents, to be aware of their needs and to know your decision to fail to pass a clean debt ceiling could have very negative consequences on our economy.

We don't have to look very far. We can look back to 2011. The GOP brinksmanship during that time cost the economy the following:

It was the first time the U.S. credit was downgraded in U.S. history by failing to increase the debt ceiling on a timely basis. We ultimately got it done, but it was delayed. There was some concern in the markets of what would happen, and it resulted in the first U.S. credit downgrade in our history.

Are we going to allow that to happen again?

The stock market plummeted 17 percent. Consumer confidence dropped to its lowest point since the financial crisis of 2008. We saw businesses stop hiring in 2011 with one of the lowest months of job growth over the last 2 years during that period.

We have seen what the consequences of failing to pass a clean, swift debt ceiling would mean. Why would we even toy with the idea of failing to do it now, or to do it by adding conditions to it that basically hold the bill up as a hostage?

Finally, there was \$1.3 billion added to our national debt for fiscal year 2011 and \$19 billion over 10 years in higher government borrowing costs. If you are a fiscal hawk—if you are someone who is concerned like I am about our Federal deficit, if you want to have good fiscal discipline—then you might want to pass a clean, swift debt ceiling bill so that we don't have added costs to our national debt and so that we don't have additional borrowing expenses added to a debt and a deficit that under this administration in the last few years has been on the decline.

Let's do our job. Let's help the process. Let's move our country forward. Let's work together. Let's be a Congress that acts, not a Congress that continues to obstruct.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank my good friend and colleague for that thorough explanation again as to why there is such urgency in terms of our acting now.

Throughout my time here in the Congress, we consistently hear about strict constructionism and adherence to the

Constitution. The 14th Amendment of the Constitution reads in part: The validity of the public debt authorized by law shall not be questioned. That is a constitutional principle, and it is the reason the brinksmanship that we have seen time and time again is so reckless and threatens the well-being of the American people.

Earlier in my remarks, I referenced this being a “Yogi Berra moment,” that great Yankee catcher having once made the observation that he feels like it is *déjà vu* all over again. There is another contemporary, urban philosopher I want to quote. Her name is Mary J. Blige. She said: No more drama.

I think that the American people are tired of drama and theatrics. If they want theatrics, they can go to Broadway in New York City. If they want drama, you have got Hollywood, but Congress is here to do the business of the American people, not to entertain, but to do the business of the American people. The matter before us that, hopefully, we will deal with this week—not with unnecessary ideological demands that we attempt to inflict on the American people—in order to do what our constitutional responsibility says Congress should do is, again, a clean debt ceiling.

I want to explain as best I can to those who are interested in understanding how we arrived at this moment. When you hear characterizations about what is at stake, why we can't just simply raise the debt ceiling without going through the drama and the theatrics, the representation that is made, which seems reasonable to many, is that we have a \$17 trillion-plus debt. That is a very significant number, and we can't just simply give the President the unfettered ability to continue to drag this country further down a debt hole. That is the argument that is advanced by many, Mr. Speaker.

It is just fundamentally inaccurate. The debt ceiling is not a forward-looking vehicle designed to give the President the ability to spend more money.

□ 2115

It is a backward-looking vehicle simply designed to give the President the capacity to pay bills that the Congress has already incurred. And if you actually were to inspect what those bills actually were, many Americans would be surprised to know that it was incurred often by those same individuals who now claim the mantle of fiscal responsibility.

And so let's go through this chart. What it does is illustrates both the projected debt under current policies, largely enacted during the administration of George W. Bush, and what the debt would have been without these factors.

So the top line is an illustration of what the current debt is and what it is projected to be over time in advance of 2019 as a result of things that this Congress has already done that were not

paid for, and the lowest line on the chart is an illustration of what the debt would be had these things not been done, Mr. Speaker.

What is interesting is that a significant part of the debt, as this chart illustrates, resulted from the war in Iraq, a completely unnecessary war, chasing down weapons of mass destruction that did not exist. Lies were told to the American people and hundreds of billions of dollars unnecessarily spent and debt incurred under the previous administration.

The war in Afghanistan was inappropriately prosecuted. Even if it was, in the beginning, a necessary one in response to the tragedy on 9/11, it was inappropriately prosecuted because we were distracted in Iraq. We didn't pay for that war either. It is responsible for the debt burden that we now have.

The Bush-era tax cuts. A tax cut in 2001 largely and disproportionately benefited the wealthy and well-off, not paid for. It is responsible, in part, for the debt burden that we now confront.

Another tax cut enacted by this Congress in 2003 largely benefiting the wealthy and the well-off was not paid for and responsible, in part, for the debt that we have incurred.

Of course, there was the economic downturn. That occurred in 2008. It resulted, in part, from the failed policies of the previous administration.

And we allowed some on Wall Street to run wild and to plunge us into the worst economic collapse since the Great Depression. That, in part, is responsible for the debt that we have incurred. We had to bail out Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. There was the TARP bailout.

Then, of course, there were the recovery measures enacted in response to this horrible collapse of the economy inflicted upon the American people.

These are the policies that are largely responsible for the debt that we find ourselves in, and that is why we find it a bit curious that President Obama is often blamed and we have got to have this drama connected to the debt ceiling, when, in fact, much of the debt, the bills that he is trying to pay now, he wasn't even responsible for. In fact, when a lot of these policies were enacted, the current President of the United States was in the Illinois State Legislature, yet you want to blame him for the out-of-control spending. It is not just factually accurate.

Mr. HORSFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JEFFRIES. I will yield to the gentleman from Nevada.

Mr. HORSFORD. I appreciate you providing this historical context because, as you indicate, a lot of times on this floor we tend to focus on the rhetoric of the day and not the facts of the matter.

As you have well illustrated here, if it were not for the Bush-era tax cuts, which are the biggest contributing factor to the debt and the deficit—and the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan—we prob-

ably would be in a much better position to address the domestic needs in this country and to have the type of economic investments to help grow our economy, put people to work, grow and build up our infrastructure, help our roads, our highways, our schools, the things that matter here in the United States.

But yet money has been obligated by previous administrations, enacted by Members of Congress before you and I got here, and now this Congress and some on the other side want to hold the process hostage and add a new set of demands and conditions to that process for items that this administration or current Members of Congress and our constituents, who are expecting us to do our job, did not have the decision to begin with.

So I appreciate you giving that historical perspective, and I hope that my colleagues on the other side will listen to the facts of the matter and move away from this drama of the brinksmanship and the political games that, unfortunately, are done too often to distract from the realities of the issues that you brought forward.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

As you have pointed out—I think this was very important—in terms of the explosion of the public debt that has taken place over the last decade or so, the most significant factor, as this chart illustrates, is the Bush-era tax cuts.

And so the question, then, that many people back home in my district are asking is, What was it all for? Because now we know that income inequality has exploded out of control. The middle class is being left behind.

What was it all for?

Well, we were told, based on a very stale, old philosophy, that these type of tax cuts help to generate economic activity. They create jobs. Okay.

In the previous 8 years prior to the Bush administration, during the 8 years of the Presidency of Bill Clinton, the tax rate for the highest income bracket was 39.6 percent, and 20.3 million jobs were created during those 8 years. And then we have a new President who comes in and, by the way, he inherits a surplus. And then immediately, as a result of these reckless policies, foreign and domestic, creates deficit after deficit after deficit. That didn't happen under this President. It happened under the previous President.

But the American people, the people whom I represent back at home, say, What was it all for? A tax rate of 39.6 percent under the administration of President Clinton and 20.3 million jobs created. We get tax cuts in 2001 and 2003 as a precursor to the recession, and during the 8 years of the previous administration we lost 650,000 jobs here in America.

What was it all for? We lost jobs. Income inequality has grown. You add it to the debt. And yet folks on this side of the aisle are supposed to be fiscally irresponsible.

Let's just have a reasonable, evidence-based conversation. That is all we want. That is what the American people are asking for.

And so as we prepare to close, let me just yield to my good friend for any parting remarks.

Mr. HORSFORD. One additional area that I would like to touch on and ask, maybe, my colleague to expound upon is that, under those Bush-era tax cuts, it included tax cuts to companies that ship jobs overseas, which contributed, did it not, to that 650,000 job loss? Was there a correlation there or not?

Mr. JEFFRIES. I think that is a very appropriate question. We are going to have to have a broader conversation about some of our policies that have resulted in the exportation of middle class American jobs to other parts of the world; and for the life of me, I haven't been able to figure out why anyone in Washington thinks that that is a good idea.

We have had an economic recovery under this President, and I believe more than 7 million private sector jobs have been created, but we still have a long way to go. And we certainly cannot afford to engage in the type of policies that, as you have pointed out, have led to the transfer of American jobs overseas.

Why? Because we are incentivizing companies to ship jobs abroad as opposed to incentivizing American companies to keep jobs here at home in the great United States of America. And I certainly hope that that is something that can be reversed as we move forward and enter into a discussion about some of the agreements that will be pending before this Congress.

Mr. HORSFORD. If the gentleman would yield, I would just say—and I think that this would be an appropriate discussion for us to have at a future Special Order—the fact that some of those corporate tax breaks to ship American jobs overseas resulted in debt that is now being obligated by this country into future years indicates a change in policy that we need to have.

We agree we need tax reform in this country. We need tax reform that allows those jobs to be returned to the United States by eliminating the corporate welfare that was provided by giving those tax incentives to those companies to take American jobs overseas to begin with and, to add insult to injury, to have it included in the overall debt and obligations of this country going forward.

But the bottom line here tonight, Mr. Speaker, is we have a job to do this week, and that job, we are asking, is to bring a clean, swift, debt ceiling bill to the floor without a bunch of conditions or demands, and allow this Congress to do its job this week and send to the Senate a clean debt ceiling bill that allows us to meet our obligations.

Those obligations, as my colleague here tonight has aptly explained, are obligations that prior administrations

and prior Congresses have entered this country into. We have to keep the full faith and credit of the United States intact. We cannot repeat some of the damaging consequences from 2011. We cannot have a repeat, Mr. Speaker, of lost economic productivity or economic activity. We cannot have the stock market plummeting. We cannot have lower consumer confidence. We cannot have businesses deciding whether to hire more employees because they are concerned that this Congress is going to cause more harm than help by failing to pass a clean debt ceiling.

That is what we are asking here tonight.

I thank my colleague, the anchor for this hour, the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), for leading this discussion. I am pleased to have participated.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank my good friend for his very thoughtful and comprehensive remarks and analysis of the situation that we find ourselves in and his very clear-eyed plea that we in the Congress simply do our job and raise the debt ceiling to avoid a default and threatening of the full faith and credit of the United States of America.

The 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution states, in part, that the validity of the public debt of the United States enacted into law shall not be questioned.

No more drama. No more theatrics. No more brinksmanship. No more extremism. Let's raise the debt ceiling and get back to doing the business of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues Congressmen Jeffries and Congressman Horsford for once again leading the Congressional Black Caucus Special Order Hour.

As a result of your leadership, the Congressional Black Caucus continues to discuss critical issues facing our nation on the House floor and to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss why we must raise our nation's debt ceiling and bring a clean debt ceiling bill to the floor.

The full faith and credit of the United States should not be subject to negotiation.

On Friday, February 7th, the United States of America once again reached its debt limit.

Treasury Secretary Jack Lew has again begun paying our bills with what he calls "extraordinary measures."

This is not a new situation for us, as we have been here many times before.

And we have seen that each time we face this fully preventable crisis, the result is harm to the American people and to this nation's international economic reputation.

In August 2011, Members of Congress faced a debt ceiling standoff that resulted in the Budget Control Act of 2011.

Because we could not come to a budget agreement as required by the Budget Control Act, Congress instituted automatic spending cuts to our military and to critical services to our communities.

In October 2013, we faced another debt limit crisis when our government shut down for

17 days, leaving hundreds of thousands of government workers unsure of when their next paycheck would arrive.

By the end of February, if we do not raise the debt limit, we will again be teetering at the end of a financial cliff.

It is reported that Republican House leadership is deciding what they should ask for in return for allowing our nation to meet its financial obligations.

Once again, they are looking to barter this country's financial well-being for narrow political wins when they've seen the harmful results of their actions.

We cannot continue to play political games when our nation's credit is at risk.

Approaching the 11th hour in this debate, when a clean debt ceiling bill can be brought to the floor today, should not be an option. It is not in the best interest of this nation.

Before I yield back, I also want to clarify what raising the debt limit means. There is often confusion about raising the debt ceiling. Some believe it allows our government to authorize additional or new spending, which is not the case.

Raising the debt ceiling does not mean our country will be allowed to spend more money; it means that we will be able to pay the financial obligations which we have incurred in the past.

Just like millions of people across this nation have bills to pay that keep the lights on in their homes, or to pay for the car they drive back and forth to work, America must pay the bills required to keep our state and local governments running.

America must make sure that millions of seniors receive their Social Security checks.

We must not let partisanship or brinkmanship do any more damage to our federal programs or our ability to borrow in the future.

This is why raising the debt ceiling is so important.

I urge my colleagues to bring a clean debt ceiling bill to the floor.

No conditions or concessions should be made in turn for raising our country's debt ceiling.

The full faith and credit of the United States is not for sale.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ADERHOLT (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and the balance of the week on account of family medical reasons.

Mrs. NOEM (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of flight cancellation.

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of illness.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. DEFAZIO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of weather in Oregon.

Ms. JACKSON LEE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of business in the district.

Ms. MATSUI (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of illness.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of an illness in the family.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the

House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 11, 2014, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the fourth quarter of 2013 pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Anne Marie Chotvacs	11/4	11/7	Egypt		856.00						856.00
Commercial airfare							10,135.10				10,135.10
Misc. embassy costs								714.00			714.00
Jennifer Miller	11/4	11/6	Turkey		514.00						514.00
	11/6	11/8	Qatar		566.00						566.00
	11/8	11/12	Jordan		1,560.00						1,560.00
Commercial airfare							12,189.05				12,189.05
Hon. Ken Calvert	11/21	11/25	Portugal		706.00						706.00
Commercial airfare							6,619.10				6,619.10
Hon. Mario Diaz-Balart	11/26	11/27	Belgium		648.00						648.00
Commercial airfare							10,994.90				10,994.90
Total					4,850.00		39,938.15		714.00		45,502.15

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. HAROLD ROGERS, Chairman, Jan. 31, 2014.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Visit to Turkey, Lebanon, Egypt—October 30–November 4, 2013 with STAFFDEL Karem:											
Michael Casey	10/31	11/3	Lebanon		150.00						150.00
	11/3	11/4	Turkey		262.00						262.00
Commercial transportation	11/3	11/4					5,459.50				5,459.50
Visit to Germany, Poland, United Kingdom—Nov. 4–11, 2013											
Hon. Michael Turner	11/5	11/8	Germany		366.00						366.00
	11/7	11/7	Poland								
	11/8	11/10	United Kingdom		368.00						368.00
Hon. Loretta Sanchez	11/5	11/8	Germany		366.00						366.00
	11/7	11/7	Poland								
	11/8	11/10	United Kingdom		368.00						368.00
John Wason	11/5	11/8	Germany		366.00						366.00
	11/7	11/7	Poland								
	11/8	11/10	United Kingdom		368.00						368.00
Douglas Bush	11/5	11/8	Germany		366.00						366.00
	11/7	11/7	Poland								
	11/8	11/10	United Kingdom		368.00						368.00
Visit to Philippines—Nov. 22–26, 2013 with CODEL Smith:											
Hon. Trent Franks	11/2	11/26	Philippines		577.00						577.00
Visit to India—Dec. 14–22, 2013 with CODEL Holding:											
Hon. Madeleine Bordallo	12/15	12/21	India		670.00						670.00
Commercial transportation							539.24				539.24
Total					670.00		539.24				1,209.24

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON, Chairman, Jan. 31, 2014.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Mary Neumayr	11/18	11/23	Poland		2,087.06		1,966.20				4,053.26
Phillip Barnett	11/19	11/22	Poland		1,043.53		1,566.20				2,609.73
Gregory Dotson	11/19		Poland						³ 791.53		791.53
Hon. Pete Olson	12/14	12/17	India		1,718.36		10,665.01				12,383.37
Committee total					4,848.95		14,197.41		791.53		19,837.89

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Cancellation fee for lodging in Poland. Gregory Dotson did not travel on the STAFFDEL.

Hon. FRED UPTON, Chairman, Jan. 29, 2014.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Al Green	11/23	11/26	Philippines								
Hon. Robert Pittenger	12/18	12/19	Israel		843.00						843.00
	12/19	12/20	Austria		632.12						632.12
	12/20	12/21	Norway		343.56		12,333.47				12,677.03
Committee totals					1,818.68		12,333.47				14,152.15

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. JEB. HENSARLING, Chairman, Jan. 31, 2014.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Adam Kinzinger	11/1	11/2	Pakistan		22.00	4,676.20					4,698.20
	11/2	11/3	Afghanistan			(³)					
	11/3	11/4	UAE		266.07				4,397.75		663.82
Hon. Scott Perry	11/1	11/2	Pakistan		42.00	11,964.20					12,006.20
	11/2	11/3	Afghanistan		28.00	(³)					28.00
	11/3	11/4	UAE		369.07						369.07
Hon. Juan Vargas	11/1	11/2	Pakistan		42.00	12,901.20					12,943.20
	11/2	11/3	Afghanistan		28.00	(³)					28.00
	11/3	11/4	UAE		369.07						369.07
Andrea Thompson	11/1	11/2	Pakistan								
	11/2	11/3	Afghanistan			(³)					
	11/3	11/4	UAE								
Sajit Gandhi	11/1	11/2	Pakistan		32.00	11,964.20					11,996.20
	11/2	11/3	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	11/3	11/4	UAE		369.07						369.07
Leah Campos	11/3	11/6	Mexico		911.00	932.83					1,843.83
Ramon Zertuche	11/3	11/6	Mexico		981.00	1,023.33					2,004.33
Chris Smith	11/23	11/26	Philippines		581.00	7,536.90			4,44.85		8,162.75
Greg Simpkins	11/23	11/26	Philippines		583.33	7,736.90					8,320.23
Piero Tozzi	11/23	11/26	Philippines		693.15	8,571.70					9,264.85
Thomas Hill	11/23	11/25	Honduras		526.00	1,030.90					1,556.90
Edward Acevedo	11/23	11/25	Honduras		486.00	1,065.90					1,551.90
Brent Woolfork	11/23	11/25	Honduras		505.42	1,065.90					1,571.32
Janice Kaguyutan	11/23	11/25	Honduras		508.72	1,030.90					1,539.62
Hon. Adam Kinzinger	11/22	11/24	Canada		534.47	1,296.67					1,831.14
Hon. Steve Chabot	11/5	11/6	Bangladesh		460.00	11,296.80					11,756.80
	11/4	11/4	UAE						4,299.48		299.48
Kevin Fitzpatrick	11/5	11/6	Bangladesh		465.00	11,296.80					11,761.80
	11/4	11/4	UAE								11,761.80
Hon. Ted Poe	11/22	11/26	Peru		1,093.47	1,598.14					2,691.61
Hon. Lois Frankel	11/22	11/25	Peru		763.20	1,470.64					2,233.84
Luke Murry	11/22	11/26	Peru		1,269.13	1,132.64					2,401.77
Ramon Zertuche	11/22	11/26	Peru		1,288.42	1,633.64					2,922.06
Hon. George Holding	12/15	12/20	India		1,430.38	12,032.91			4,20,279.06		33,742.35
Helen Heng	12/16	12/20	India		1,522.78	13,752.41					15,275.19
Hunter Strupp	12/15	12/20	India		1,568.36	10,749.91					12,318.27
Sajit Gandhi	12/15	12/20	India		1,603.36	10,034.97					11,638.33
Hon. Greg Meeks	11/25	11/25	Germany								
	11/25	11/27	Belgium		807.07	5,734.50					6,541.57
Committee total					20,176.54	153,531.09			21,021.14		194,728.77

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.⁴ Indicates delegation costs.

HON. EDWARD R. ROYCE, Chairman, Oct. 31, 2013.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
HOUSE COMMITTEES											
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.☒											

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. CANDICE S. MILLER, Chairman, Jan. 9, 2014.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Jason Chaffetz	11/9	11/10	Malta		156.00						156.00
	11/10	11/12	Egypt		819.43						819.43
Commercial airfare							15,307.65				15,307.65
Hon. Cynthia Lummis	11/9	11/10	Malta		271.00						271.00
	11/10	11/12	Egypt		895.43						895.43
Commercial airfare							15,829.20				15,829.20
Hon. Stephen Lynch	11/9	11/10	Malta		271.00						271.00
	11/10	11/12	Egypt		895.43						895.43
Commercial airfare							14,512.20				14,512.20

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2013—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Peter Welch	11/9	11/10	Malta		271.00						271.00
Commercial airfare	11/10	11/12	Egypt		895.43						895.43
Ali Ahmad							14,639.10				14,639.10
Commercial airfare	11/9	11/10	Malta		196.00						196.00
Commercial airfare	11/10	11/12	Egypt		870.92						870.92
Bruce Fernandez							11,556.10				11,556.10
Commercial airfare	11/9	11/10	Malta		271.00						271.00
Commercial airfare	11/10	11/12	Egypt		895.43						895.43
James Lewis							10,365.70				10,365.70
Commercial airfare	11/9	11/10	Malta		211.00						211.00
Commercial airfare	11/10	11/12	Egypt		861.43						861.43
Delegation expenses							14,140.20				14,140.20
Committee total					7,780.50		96,50.15		1,054.00		105,184.65

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. DARRELL E. ISSA, Chairman, Jan. 31, 2014.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. David Schweikert	12/15	12/22	India	41,915.20	670.00		15,129.91				15,799.91
Committee total			670.00				15,129.91				15,799.91

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. LAMAR SMITH, Chairman, Jan. 31, 2014.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☐¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. BILL SHUSTER, Chairman, Jan. 12, 2014.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Stephen Claeys	12/3	12/6	Indonesia		1,197.00		³ 19,226.20				20,423.20
Elizabeth Baitzan	12/3	12/6	Indonesia		1,317.00		³ 12,382.10				13,699.10
Stephen Claeys	12/6	12/11	Singapore		2,093.00						2,093.00
Behnaz Kibria	12/6	12/11	Singapore		1,982.00		13,419.50				15,401.50
Committee total					6,589.00		45,027.80				51,616.80

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Cost included in above flight.

HON. DAVE CAMP, Chairman, Jan. 31, 2014.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Devin Nunes	11/21	11/25	Europe		706.00						
Commercial airfare							6,780.60				7,486.60
Andy Keiser, Professional Staff	11/21	11/25	Europe		706.00						
Commercial airfare							2,351.60				3,057.60
Hon. Mike Rogers	12/15	12/18	Europe		754.29						
Commercial airfare							1,834.30				2,588.59
Hon. C.A. Dutch Ruppersberger	12/15	12/18	Europe		754.29						
Commercial airfare							1,834.30				2,588.59
Hon. Mike Pompeo	12/15	12/18	Europe		754.29						
Commercial airfare							1,834.30				2,588.59
Hon. Terri A. Sewell	12/15	12/18	Europe		754.29						
Commercial airfare							1,834.30				2,588.59
Darren Dick, Staff Director	12/15	12/18	Europe		754.29						
Commercial airfare							1,834.30				2,588.59

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2013—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Tom Corcoran, Professional Staff	12/15	12/18	Europe		754.29						
Commercial airfare							1,834.30				2,588.59
Susan Phalen, Professional Staff	12/15	12/18	Europe		754.29						
Commercial airfare							1,834.30				2,588.59
Robert Minehart, Professional Staff	12/15	12/18	Europe		754.29						
Commercial airfare							1,799.20				2,588.59
Hon. Mike Thompson	12/13	12/19	S. America		1,614.00						
Commercial airfare							11,540.37				13,154.37
Linda Cohen, Professional Staff	12/13	12/19	S. America		1,920.00						
Commercial airfare							11,072.37				12,992.37
Hon. Michele Bachmann	12/14	12/16	Middle East		605.75						
	12/16	12/17	Middle East		75.00						
	12/17	12/17	Middle East								
	12/17	12/19	Middle East		843.00						
	12/19	12/20	Europe		417.00						
	12/20	12/21	Europe		344.42						
Commercial airfare							13,850.40				16,135.57
Committee total											73,500.13

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. MIKE ROGERS, Chairman, Jan. 30, 2014.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4713. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the System's "Major" final rule — Prohibitions and Restrictions on Proprietary Trading and Certain Interests in, and Relationships With, Hedge Funds and Private Equity Funds [Docket No.: OCC-2014-0003] (RIN: 1557-AD79) received January 31, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4714. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations, (Rockland County, NY, et al.); [Docket ID: FEMA-2013-0002] received January 31, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4715. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations (Isabella County, MI, et al.); [Docket ID: FEMA-2013-0002] received January 31, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4716. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations (Dearborn County, IN, et al.); [Docket ID: FEMA-2013-0002] received January 31, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4717. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations (Fort Bend County, TX, et al.); [Docket ID: FEMA-2013-0002] received January 31, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4718. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility (Erie County, PA, et al.); [Docket ID: FEMA-2013-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8317] received January 31, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4719. A letter from the Regulatory Specialist, LRAD, Department of the Treasury,

transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Treatment of Certain Collateralized Debt Obligations Backed Primarily by Trust Preferred Securities With Regard to Prohibitions and Restrictions on Certain Interests in, and Relationships With, Hedge Funds and Private Equity Funds [Docket No.: OCC-2014-0003] (RIN: 1557-AD79) received January 31, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4720. A letter from the Regulatory Specialist, LRA, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Prohibitions and Restrictions on Proprietary Trading and Certain Interests in, and Relationships With, Hedge Funds and Private Equity Funds [Docket No. OCC-2011-0014] (RIN: 1557-AD44) received January 31, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4721. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Removal of Transferred OTS Regulations Regarding Recordkeeping and Confirmation Requirements for Securities Transactions Effected by State Savings Associations and Other Amendments (RIN: 3064-AE06) received January 31, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4722. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's "Major" final rule — Treatment of Certain Collateralized Debt Obligations Backed Primarily by Trust Preferred Securities With Regard to Prohibitions and Restrictions on Certain Interests in, and Relationships with, Hedge Funds and Private Equity Funds (RIN: 3064-AE11) received January 31, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4723. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's "Major" final rule — Prohibitions and Restrictions on Proprietary Trading and Certain Interests in, and Relationships With, Hedge Funds and Private Equity Funds (RIN: 3064-AD85) received January 31, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4724. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Information to Be Distributed to the Federal Home Loan Banks and the Office of Finance Under 12

CFR Part 1260 [No. 2013-N-15] received January 31, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4725. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's "Major" final rule — Treatment of Certain Collateralized Debt Obligations Backed Primarily by Trust Preferred Securities With Regard to Prohibitions and Restrictions on Certain Interests in, and Relationships With, Hedge Funds and Private Equity Funds (RIN: 3235-AL52) received January 29, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4726. A letter from the Director, Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Advisory Committee; Pharmacy Compounding Advisory Committee [Docket No.: FDA-2013-N-1687] received January 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4727. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Current Good Manufacturing Practice for Medicated Feeds [Docket No.: FDA-2013-N-0002] received January 13, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4728. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Institutes of Health Loan Repayment Programs [Docket No.: NIH-2008-0003] (RIN: 0905-AA43) received January 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4729. A letter from the Director, Regulations Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-2013-0725; FRL-9904-02-Region 9] received January 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4730. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — List of Approved Spent Fuel Storage Casks: HI-STORM 100 Cask System; Amendment No. 9 [NRC-2012-0052] (RIN: 3150-

AJ12) received January 23, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4731. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Shrimp Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Establish Funding Responsibilities for the Electronic Logbook Program [Docket No.: 130710605-3999-02] (RIN: 0648-BD41) received January 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4732. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River Mile 94.1 — Mile 95.1; New Orleans, LA [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0989] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 28, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4733. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone, Lucas Oil Drag Boat Racing Series; Thompson Bay, Lake Havasu City, AZ [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0746] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 8, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4734. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Hazardous Materials Safety, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hazardous Materials: Adoption of ASME Code Section XII and the National Board Inspection Code [Docket Number: PHMSA-2010-0019 (HM-241)] (RIN: 2137-AE-58) received January 23, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4735. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0365; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-223-AD; Amendment 39-17704; AD 2013-25-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 23, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4736. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Turbomeca S.A. Turboshift Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0557; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-22-AD; Amendment 39-17679; AD 2013-24-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 23, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4737. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Section 5000A Transition Relief for Individuals with Certain Government-Sponsored Limited-Benefit Health Coverage [Notice 2014-10] received January 31, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4738. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Applicable Federal Rates — February 2014 (Rev. Rul. 2014-6) received January 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4739. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Temporary Nondiscrimination Relief for Closed Defined Benefit Plans and Request for Comments [Notice 2014-5] received January 28, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4740. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Deadline to Submit Opinion and Advisory Letter Applications for Pre-approved Defined Benefit Plans is Extended to February 2, 2015 (Announcement 2014-4) received January 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4741. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Extension of Time under Sec. 301.9100-3 to Elect Portability of Deceased Spousal Unused Exclusion Amount (Rev. Proc. 2014-18) received January 31, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4742. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Revenue Procedure: Qualified Census Tracts (Rev. Proc. 2014-9) received January 28, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 2385. A bill to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to set the rate of pay for employees of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection in accordance with the General Schedule (Rept. 113-349, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 475. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3193) to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to strengthen the review authority of the Financial Stability Oversight Council of regulations issued by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and for other purposes; providing for proceedings during the period from February 13, 2014, through February 24, 2014; and for other purposes (Rept. 113-350). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2385 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 4021. A bill to suspend the application of the limit on the Nation's debt for a 10-year period, to reduce the pay of Members of Congress for failing to meet fiscal sustainability targets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LYNCH (for himself and Mr. CUMMINGS):

H.R. 4022. A bill to provide for a strategic plan to reform and improve the security clearance and background investigation processes of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MATHESON (for himself and Mr. CHAFFETZ):

H.R. 4023. A bill to promote competition and help consumers save money by giving them the freedom to choose where they buy prescription pet medications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. CAPITO:

H.R. 4024. A bill to protect navigable waters from contamination by chemical storage facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. TIERNEY):

H.R. 4025. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to reauthorize and amend the Fishing Safety Training Grant Program and the Fishing Safety Research Grant Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 4026. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide for the eligibility of Transportation Security Administration employees to receive public safety officers' death benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 4027. A bill to increase the statutory limit on the public debt and to require House and Senate votes on constitutional amendments to balance the Federal budget and to restrict new entitlement spending; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 4028. A bill to amend the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 to include the desecration of cemeteries among the many forms of violations of the right to religious freedom; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Missouri:

H.R. 4029. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to transfer all Federal land, facilities, and any other assets associated with the Ozark National Scenic Riverways to the State of Missouri for the purposes of maintaining a State park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida (for herself,

Mr. GARCIA, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. MICA, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. POSEY, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. ROSS, Mr. YOHIO, and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 4030. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 18640 NW 2nd Avenue in Miami, Florida, as the "Father Richard Marquess-Barry Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself and Mr. ENGEL):

H.J. Res. 109. A joint resolution providing for the approval of the Congress of the proposed agreement for cooperation between the American Institute in Taiwan and the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States concerning peaceful uses of nuclear energy pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CORRECTION TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 8, 2014 AT PAGE H72 MEMORIALS

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina, relative to H. 3400 repealing Joint Resolution 775 of 1976 which requested Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 4021.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution which states in part:

“The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.”

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 4022.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. MATHESON:

H.R. 4023.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mrs. CAPITO:

H.R. 4024.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the constitutional authority to enact this legislation pursuant to the power granted under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 3 (related to regulation of Commerce among the States).

By Mr. KEATING:

H.R. 4025.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 4026.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 4027.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1 and 2 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution.

Article V of the U.S. Constitution, which grants Congress the authority to propose Constitutional amendments.

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 4028.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SMITH of Missouri:

H.R. 4029.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2: “The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any particular state.”

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 4030.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.J. Res. 109.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 15: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 20: Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 24: Mr. HALL.

H.R. 32: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 60: Mr. FARENTHOLD and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 62: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 115: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 118: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 148: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 164: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HONDA, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. HUDSON, and Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 233: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 288: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 303: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 411: Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 494: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 503: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 508: Mr. STUTZMAN.

H.R. 580: Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 635: Mrs. ELLMERS.

H.R. 637: Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 647: Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. SWALWELL of California and Ms. MENG.

H.R. 685: Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 713: Mr. YODER and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H.R. 755: Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 795: Mr. FINCHER, Mr. GOSAR, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. PITTS, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 920: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.

H.R. 946: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 961: Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 1020: Mr. POSEY and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 1041: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1091: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 1188: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 1243: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 1249: Mr. GALLEGO.

H.R. 1250: Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 1263: Mr. DELANEY and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 1276: Mr. CARNEY, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. TIERNEY, and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 1286: Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 1313: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 1362: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 1386: Mr. BYRNE, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 1518: Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 1573: Mr. FARR.

H.R. 1627: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1630: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 1648: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 1666: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 1685: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 1701: Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 1726: Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 1814: Mr. DENHAM, Mr. BERA of California, and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 1830: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H.R. 1835: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 1838: Mr. BARBER and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 1852: Mr. NEAL and Mr. WOODALL.

H.R. 1869: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 1984: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 2068: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.

H.R. 2178: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CLAY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 2203: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 2305: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 2313: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H.R. 2333: Mr. KIND, Mr. SCHNEIDER, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 2424: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 2468: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 2504: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 2537: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H.R. 2548: Mr. SIMPSON and Mr. MAFFEI.

H.R. 2575: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. MATHESON, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 2591: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 2638: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 2652: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2707: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 2726: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 2739: Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 2746: Mr. JORDAN and Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 2788: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 2827: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 2835: Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 2841: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2847: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 2911: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 2918: Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. DENT, Mr. HORSFORD, and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 2939: Mr. HUDSON, Mr. DEUTCH, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2983: Mr. LEWIS.

H.R. 2996: Mr. LONG.

H.R. 3040: Ms. SCHWARTZ.

H.R. 3043: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 3099: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 3116: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 3133: Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. WOODALL.

H.R. 3136: Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 3137: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 3153: Ms. CHU and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 3180: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 3344: Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 3357: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 3361: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

H.R. 3370: Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr.

RUSH, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 3372: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 3374: Mr. COOPER, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 3383: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 3384: Ms. CHU and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 3403: Mr. DUFFY.

H.R. 3453: Mr. LANGEVIN and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 3461: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. WELCH, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. RUPERSBERGER, Mr. NEAL, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. GRAYSON, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 3464: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 3471: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts and Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 3485: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 3488: Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. POSEY, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. GARCIA.

H.R. 3493: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 3505: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 3510: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 3513: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. CHU.

H.R. 3530: Ms. SPEIER and Mr. MULVANEY.

H.R. 3537: Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 3546: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.

H.R. 3556: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 3579: Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. HALL, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. BARTON, and Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 3635: Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 3649: Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 3657: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 3658: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. COLE.

H.R. 3663: Mr. BARR.

H.R. 3666: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 3670: Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

H.R. 3673: Mr. BENISHEK and Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 3689: Mr. MCCLINTOCK and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 3698: Mr. COOK, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.

H.R. 3707: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 3712: Mr. SERRANO and Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 3717: Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. BERA of California.

H.R. 3740: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 3747: Mr. RUNYAN.

H.R. 3788: Mr. BARR.

H.R. 3807: Mr. HALL.

H.R. 3826: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama and Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 3850: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 3852: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 3855: Mr. YODER, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. FARR, and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 3857: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 3865: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. HALL, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BENISHEK, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Ms. FOXX, and Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 3877: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 3887: Mr. RIGELL.

H.R. 3888: Mr. CONYERS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 3895: Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 3912: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 3930: Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. MCALLISTER, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. JONES, and Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 3972: Ms. KELLY of Illinois and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 3973: Mr. FORBES and Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 3978: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 3982: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. FARR, and Ms. HANABUSA.

H.R. 3987: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. MESSER, Mr. YODER, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. LAMALFA, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 3991: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. OWENS, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 4019: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.J. Res. 2: Mr. BYRNE.

H.J. Res. 21: Mr. HIGGINS.

H. Con. Res. 16: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. HORSFORD, and Mr. JONES.

H. Con. Res. 52: Ms. ESTY.

H. Con. Res. 78: Mr. RANGEL.

H. Res. 36: Ms. GRANGER and Mr. HOLDING.

H. Res. 59: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H. Res. 72: Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H. Res. 284: Mr. VEASEY.

H. Res. 302: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. LATTA.

H. Res. 326: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

H. Res. 387: Ms. KUSTER.

H. Res. 442: Mr. LATTA, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. CARTER, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. WOMACK, and Mr. MULLIN.

H. Res. 447: Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mr. DENT.

H. Res. 467: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.